

THE  
AMERICAN QUARTERLY  
CHURCH REVIEW,  
AND  
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

---

---

VOL. XX.

APRIL, 1868.

No. 1.

---

---

## ART. I.—ORGANIZATION.

THERE is one race that we admire,—a race that sprang up in the midst of barbarism—themselves barbarians but for one power and gift, and that put them at the head of the whole world; and their one gift was organizing and administrative genius. We mean the ancient Romans. For mere intellectual qualities, they were nothing. Their poetry is imitation. Virgil, who did his best, is but a master of smooth writing; his Epic is no Epic; it has no movement, or living energy of action; it has no living characters. It was written, because Homer was the great poet of the Greeks, and wrote an Epic. Therefore Virgil, having all the literary facilities of Rome, the capital of the world, and being what we should call the Poet-Laureate, wrote an Epic too, against the grain, *invitâ Minervâ*.

Take again the Roman Drama, and here we have the stilted sentimentality of Seneca, his Latin Tragedies—which no mortal reads except he is writing a Latin dictionary—against the three Tragedians of Athens, unmatched and unmatchable, since the world began and until it ends, in all that the Tragic Muse requires of terror and pity,—and shining, glowing and glittering, each one of them, in the polished splendor of a most glorious and harmonious diction; each of them like a marble palace,

faultless in proportion, crowded with statuary, glorious in the noon-day sun.

Then, for the Greek Comedy—the Old, the Middle, and the New—all the best styles that have ever started in Europe—we have the rude buffoonery of Plautus, and the gentility without force of Terence. Both of them, we admit, men of genius, and, therefore, unlikely to be Romans ; for both, we must remember, had been slaves.

Take Cicero again, the Roman Orator, and compare him with Demosthenes. Oratory was a real requisite, a necessary qualification among the Romans as a thoroughly political people, and we suppose that Cicero made the best of it that any Roman could make. Consider his verbose grandiloquence, his piling up of swelling epithets, his insincere glittering commonplaces, and then his gorgeous stiff embroidery of rhetoric, which he manifestly measures out by the yard, retail and wholesale, and then compare all this with the dense thought, the compact forcible language, the intensity of feeling, and the energy of emotion in Demosthenes, which thunders and lightens,—that Greek *δευροτης*; no other language can express ;—and you see a stump-speaker of Kentucky or Tennessee, comparing himself with Daniel Webster. Phillips, the Irish orator (very Irish indeed), Thomas Marshall, of Kentucky, are, as Cicero was, stump-speakers, brilliant rhetoricians and advocates, perfect in their way. Webster, Henry Clay and Demosthenes are orators.

And then Cicero, the Philosopher ; and Seneca, the Philosopher ! The one a lawyer, training himself in Greek Philosophy as a literary exercise ; the other a courtier, rolling in wealth, and apologizing for the crimes of Nero, writing Philosophy, as Rousseau and Sterne wrote morality and sentiment. What a pair of Philosophers are these ! and yet the best that Roman Literature can produce. There is no earnestness about them, no sincerity, no faith. They expatiate and discourse upon Philosophy in a mere dilettantè style ; it never comes from their heart or touches their life in any way. The one is an Academic, the other a Stoic. They might as well be called by any other names. Compare them with Xenophanes of Elea, with Pythagoras, with Socrates and Plato, with Zeno the Stoic, or even with

Epicurus. Each of these men intensely earnest in his dogma, and preaching it to the Grecian world for its salvation (as St. Paul and St. Peter afterwards preached Jesus and the Resurrection), with a sincerity and a self-denial in its behalf that scorned and despised all power and wealth and fame. And then look at these two Roman Philosophers—the vain rhetorician, who thought of nothing but the glory and fame of Marcus Tullius Cicero; the money-greedy Stoic sophister, with his pretty tinkling antithetic style, whose whole admiration was Marcus Annæus Seneca.

Philosophy in truth was no natural growth of Roman soil. When they wanted a Philosopher, they had to import a Greek. Their language had not the distinctness, the subtlety, the discrimination of meaning, requisite for Philosophic thought and Philosophic discussion. Their temper was utterly averse to these, their talents unadapted to them.

And in the Arts they were just as far behind in capacity, as in Literature; in fact, far more deficient. For in Poetry and in the Drama they had good imitations—white metal, electro-plated in the best style, looking very like genuine silver. The Gothic barbarians of Europe, for centuries, have talked of Virgil and Homer, Cicero and Demosthenes. The eloquent Addison has, in the *Spectator*, an elaborate parallel of the *Æneid* and the *Iliad*. All of us, in boyhood, have thought Horace the first lyric poet. But in the Arts—Painting, and Sculpture and Music—Rome is utterly and absolutely barren. Who can name a Roman Sculptor, a Roman Painter, or a Roman Musician? The imagination of form—that glorious gift and most dangerous temptation of the Hellenic race—was utterly wanting in the Roman. The imagination of color, the phantasy that paints all things upon earth in the hues of Heaven, they had not. No Music was in their souls. Even no spirit-stirring melody was in their march to battle. The solitary blare of the trumpet, unvaried by tune or melody, was their battle signal. The phalanx of Macedon, or the Spartan soldiers, might move to the Dorian melody; but the Romans had no battle music. And our present instruments, our regimental bands and music, come down in about equal measure

from the Tartar fife and kettle-drum, the Moorish and Saracen cymbal and attabal, the Church melodies and marching hymns of Crusading Templars in the East, and the battle-songs and clanging quidahs of the Northmen. "Then Taillefer, the minstrel, went out before the host, flinging up his sword in the air, and singing the battle song of Rollo (*canens cantilenam Rollandi*). He slew two Saxon champions, and was slain himself by the third."\* Thus began the battle of Hastings between William the Norman, and Harold the Saxon. A Roman army did its killing in so steady business-like a method, it had no need of military music to stimulate the heroic emotions or the savage passions. The Greeks of Leonidas or Epaminondas might move

"In perfect phalanx to the Dorian mood  
Of flutes and soft recorders, such as raised  
To height of noblest tempers heroes old,  
Arming to battle, and, instead of rage,  
Deliberate valor breathed, firm and unmoved,  
With dread of death to flight, or foul retreat."

And the Quidah or Death-song of Ragner Lodbrog, composed by his Queen Aslauga, and sang through all the North, flung upon the shores of England eighty thousand warriors to avenge his death. But the Roman was no poetic champion, no excitable warrior—he was a steady soldier.

"There was," as Dollinger remarks, "a certain dryness that ran through the Roman mind," a prosaic unimaginative temper that brought every thing down to a dry business character and method. This shut out at the very first the fine Arts even in war. In fact, of the fine Arts there was only one in which the Roman people had any skill, or in which they made any progress; and this was Architecture, Civil and Military. In this the Roman certainly excelled, in a certain grand and massive, although heavy and tasteless way. Aqueducts, Law-Courts, Amphitheatres and Bridges, still remain to show his powers in this.

How then did a people, so deficient in Literature and Science—for they were just as poor in scientific as in literary culture—a nation so despicable in the eyes of Athens and Boston, become the Lords of the world, European, Asiatic and African? The

---

\* Henry of Huntingdon.



answer is manifest—lies upon the face of all History. The Roman had no fine Arts, no Music, or Sculpture or Painting. In all these no capacity, and at the best very bad taste. His Poetry, after the old Saturnian verses went out of fashion, was a mere imitation of Greek models and measures.

The Roman had none of all this. What had he then ? The Roman had three gifts, all subordinate to one great talent and faculty. In the first place, he had the sense and feeling of Law, and the genius and gift for it also. And this is a most peculiar and unfrequent national endowment. Three nations only are seen in all History to have this power and gift—the Romans, the English, and ourselves—the Romans, first and greatest. In fact we may say they were the only nation in the ancient world that had the genius for Law. The Greek had the forms and terms, but not the reality. His monarchy was despotism—tyranny its name and nature. And his democracy had no past and no future ; it was altogether of the present. A solemn Law, for instance, had been passed in one of the Greek States, was on their statute book, as we should say, having all the sanctions and solemnity of Law. With his eyes open, a rich or influential Athenian, or Corinthian, or Theban, broke that Law ; then rushed together the democratic mob of the city, Athens, Corinth or Thebes, and their vile orators and demagogues. The whole city foamed with eloquence, well paid by promises of money, place and power—and the Law was repealed forthwith, and the contrary Law enacted. And Cleon, a law-breaker, and a criminal yesterday, although not brought to trial, is a law-abiding citizen and a patriot to-day. Therefore these Republics vibrated from day to day between the most tumultuous democracy, and the arbitrary despotism of the most self-willed tyrants. Bishop Payne, our Missionary Bishop on the coast of Africa, told the writer of this paper that this was the condition of all the negro States on the West Coast, a compound of the most unbridled democracy, and the most despotic tyranny. What a curious parallel, a strange likeness ; the Athenian people and the swarming negroes in the West African villages,—the same mode of action, the same political constitution, if it may be so called, in both !

But the Roman knew the value of the past. "The wisdom of our illustrious ancestors" was, with him, as much a theme of praise, as it has been with the English constitutional Lawyers. His republicanism was no Athenian or negro democracy. The State, with him, had a fixed polity, and a rule of action for all men, clear and distinct. The past, therefore, in the shape of the Law, must overrule and mould the present. The Roman was the Churchman of Paganism; he believed in the Roman State, just as we believe in the Church. He believed in the Roman Law, just as we believe in the Gospel. But he knew men. He knew the force of men's interests and of the passions of the moment. The Law, therefore, must *speak*, it must *bind* (*Lex* from *lego*, to speak; as *edict* from *e* and *dico*, with an analogy very manifest to the verb *ligo*, to bind, the same word, originally, as *lego*). The State must *speak* to the private citizen, and *bind* his action by the Law. The Law must be written and passed, read to (some derive *lex* from *lego*, to read,) and accepted by the people. The Roman did not believe in private judgment or in individualism. The *Law of the State* must *bind the man*, and his momentary passions and interests.

In fact, take Hooker's celebrated Eulogy on Law, in the end of his first book, and Lord Coke's extravagant praises of it, in his Institutes, and similar passages can be brought from Cicero and other Roman Lawyers, showing the feeling and conviction in the nation that Law is something divine, an emanation from God, a revelation of His will to the whole human race, controlling the individual man, the passions and the interests of the moment, by the wisdom of the past, and by the great interests, the *salus populi* of the whole nation. When a nation has this feeling, and understands this fact, God has given it a work to do upon the earth.

But these unintellectual Romans had one or two gifts more. The Roman was the greatest business man in the ancient world; in fact the most of an administrator, the best executive there ever was in the world. He understood it, too. His favorite description of the perfection of a Roman is "*aptus rebus agendis*," and every quality of an executive he had in superabundance, and of the best kind. He never lost time, but was

always on hand. He thought of every thing beforehand, and was never caught unprepared. No accident found him without resource. He met circumstances, unfortunate for him, in the very best way, and took the utmost advantage of those incidents that favored him. He was always hopeful to the degree of assurance. He never despaired of himself, or of the Roman State. They thanked their unsuccessful General after the battle of *Cannæ*, "*quia non desperasset de Republicâ.*" When Hannibal was before the city, they sold, in the Forum, the ground on which his camp was placed, for it was public land. The Roman was also adroit beyond all measure, knew when to yield and when to press his point, but was tenacious of the purposes and objects of the Roman State and Polity beyond measure, and everything he did he finished, — all things he put through.

And for a nation, not intellectual, not in any way critical, or of fine tastes, they seemed to have had the gift of understanding and managing in the best way the nations of Europe — Greek or Egyptian, British or North African, Germans, Spaniards or Gauls — the Roman understood and ruled them all. And these nations seem to have felt that Roman rule was better than their own, the Roman tyrants were better than their native tyrants, the Roman Law better than their own Law ; and so Rome never lost a Colony. It was not until the head was crushed that the body was dismembered. With all other Empires the reverse has been the case. The Byzantine, the Mongol, the Spanish, the Turkish, Empires — from all these limb after limb has been torn away, province after province rent from the body, until the Empire died. Rome alone died entire and un mutilated. This Empire only could be slain by the mortal wound that crushed the head.

In fact the executive and administrative power, the national ability of managing business and men, in every way, was a peculiar Roman gift. It runs through the whole nation, and was in every individual as a national talent. Of course we must consider that they were a heathen race, their Law was a heathen Law, and their Polity a heathen Polity. But still, although tainted by these faults, it is delightful to see wisdom

and ability and consistent steadiness in the management of affairs. And it is wonderful to contrast this consistency of theirs with the cruelty and savagery of the Gallic and Germanic races, the vile corruption and disintegration of intellectual Greece, and the boundless luxury and merciless blood-thirstiness of Asia, whether ruled by Greek or native princes. The Roman did many a stern and hard thing ; but he conquered the European, Asiatic, and African world of his day. And he deserved to do it. And the powers that he overthrew were, in all respects of morality, of honesty and decency, far inferior to him. The princes and powers of the world of that era deserved to be overthrown ; and, for the nations of the earth, the Roman Government was a great gain.

His third gift, or rather his one great inclination and faculty, was the gift of ORGANIZATION. The Roman was the greatest organizer the world has ever seen. He enforced order, so that all parts of the machinery of the State should work readily. Equality of burdens and duties he placed upon all. He called up the powers of all the subjects, and all the resources of the country, to the aid of the State. Officers and magistrates he arranged in the most distinct and exact way. He enrolled and classified all property, all rights and privileges he brought out distinctly. All men fell into rank at once under the Roman rule. All must work, and work smoothly ; for the Roman rule was the perfection of Organization—the Roman was the most perfect Organizer. The machine of Government he put together in the best way ; he made it to work most steadily, most smoothly, at an uniform rate of expense and maintenance.

An European nation was generally benefitted by acceptance of the Roman dominion ; nay, all Europe itself was benefitted. Take one small instance : here is the Roman world, in the year four hundred, we will say ; it did not embrace the present Russia—but it had, beside Europe, Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, all North Africa and Morocco, countries then densely populated, a mass of territory and population that may well go against Russia—and all the standing army required to govern the entire Roman world was three hundred and seventy-five thousand men. The present European Kingdoms and

Governments have standing armies to the amount of four millions and a half !

Then again, take in regard to the matter of Peace, this wretched piece of organized brutality that we call the Feudal System of Middle Age Europe, (this, we may say, began to come into existence when the grand idea of an European Empire, which Charlemagne had taken from Rome, finally failed,) and compare it with the Roman system. That system certainly was a gain to Europe, when Egypt could not go to war against Syria, or Greece against Asia, or Germany against Gaul, because they were all integral parts of the great Roman Empire. But look at Europe since the date of Charlemagne. Since the Carlovingian Empire failed, has it not been ceaseless war ? Was there not, for eight hundred years together, a time when each Land-holder, Count or Prince, Graf or Herzog, Baron, Earl or Duke, had the right of war ? Five hundred Sovereignities at once existed in Germany alone—and all over Europe ceaseless murder and robbery went on under the name of legal war, as bad as in Dahomey and Ashantee.

Would it not even now be a gain to the tax-payers of Europe, that France and England, Austria and Russia, Denmark and Sweden—all these countries of Europe, which, for a thousand years, have been ravaging, murdering, robbing, destroying life and wasting property—were under one great Empire, had no right of making war upon one another, but simply enjoyed the powers and rights of internal self-government ?

If the Empire could have been converted and become Christian, it would have been for Europe the best thing in the world. For its destruction was the destruction of the most perfect organization of the European countries, as regards their relations to one another. But the Empire was essentially pagan, and it perished. It could not be converted, and Christendom since then has supplied no such arrangement of powers. Charlemagne got the idea, and was trying to restore Law and Order and Civilization to Europe ; but the savage self-will and greediness of the German races, backed up by new robber-floods of Northmen from the Baltic, and by the Saracen inroads from the South, defeated his purpose, and the result is, that Europe

is what it is, and in it, from the year eight hundred, to the present time,—one thousand years,—there have been more wars, more destruction of life and property in war, than in the four hundred years from Julius Cæsar to the downfall of the Empire, ten times over, century for century, year for year—and all this owing to the fact that the Romans had the peculiar gift and power of ORGANIZATION. The German races were endowed with the spirit of self-will and rebellion against all Law, which their philosophic descendants call the Old Northern spirit of individual freedom !

But the mark of the Roman Organizer is so plain on Europe, even when his greatest work, the Roman Empire, has been overthrown, that Palgrave, the greatest of English Historians, declares, that, “to all intents and purposes, the Roman Empire in Europe never perished ; the trunk of the tree was cut down, but from its undestroyed root sprang ten trees to supply its place.” Indeed, when we look at the matter steadily and fairly, our illustrious ancestors, the Teutonic robber tribes by land, and the Baltic sea-robbers, were an unmixed flood of savagery. They sank the whole European soil in barbarism, and civilization rose, not from them, as English and Germans vainly dream, not from Feudalism, “or the free spirit of the North,” “the personal feeling of freedom in the Teutonic races,” but from the remains of Roman Institutions. The Roman Municipia, that lay as islands in the flood, with their magistrates, their laws and their police, were the points from which civilization started again, and began to grow. All over Europe, these were its centres of origination and growth. And then, too, as to all the Law, all the rights and the justice of Europe : the great Civil Law of Rome, the Institutes, Code and Pandects, formed the working methods and the outer body of principles and doctrines, and the influence of the Bible and the Church the spirit. Take the Scriptures, the Roman Law, and the Roman cities that survived in Europe, and from them all Organization, all Civilization in Europe, originates. Goths and Burgundians, Vandals and Franks, Saxons and Angles and Jutes—their laws, their customs, their tempers, their traditions and usages, made up the savagery of Europe. Fierce

energy, strong brains, and strong bodies (no small gifts indeed), were all the merits they possessed. But to say, that Modern Civilization arose from them, or anything of theirs, is sheer absurdity. Their traditions are, to this day, the main impediments to progress all over Europe, in all its countries.

Having seen that the great gift of the Roman was the power of Organization, it is worth while to consider the means he made use of, the basis upon which he placed his machinery, the centres from which he worked. The City, organized under rule and law;—this was his centre, and his base of action. It was the *Municipium*, and from it the whole Roman Law is *Lex Municipalis*.

In fact, the city is the compulsory school of all legislation, all organization, as to property and life. Take a fertile country and scatter families over it at great distances, and savage life may endure for ages. Isolated tribes of hunters, as among the Indians of this country—the pastoral life, as over Asia, from the earliest ages—chieftainry and the tribal relations of the clan, as in Ireland—the feudal estates and castles of France and Germany—produce no civilization, no advance on barbarism. But let men be massed together in cities, and the lines of definite right, as to life and property, must be strictly drawn, public action upon them must be prompt and energetic and equal, or the city becomes a den of lust, robbery and murder. The Roman city had its original founders, of the *Prisci Latini*, a sober and grave race, and its first accession of growth was of wandering soldiers, outlaws, fugitive slaves, and pirates from the sea. Then came the Sabines, with their fierceness and rudeness; then the Etrurian chieftains, and finally the Celtic flood. A city of these elements must either bridle them by Law, prompt and energetic, equable and vigorous, or perish. This necessity, for three hundred and fifty years, was the formative power of the national Roman character and the Roman State; the Kings first, the Patricians next, as a controlling and governing body, and finally the Plebeians and the whole Roman race. They are all the same class of character, all cast in the same mould, Organizers, Administrators, Legalists, all of them. Stern, prompt and ener-



getic in applying the remedy to wrong of all kinds, but still according to the Law, the only rule that they had. Justice without mercy was certainly the Roman rule, but still it was *Justice*.

Let any one that wishes a beautiful example of the Roman civic methods, read in Livy the account of the suppression, in Rome, in the year 186 B. C., of the Bacchanals, a fanatical, licentious, murderous secret society, that came from the East. Livy gives the whole account of the procedure of the action of the *Consuls*, *Albinus* and *Phillippus*, of the deliberations of the Senate and the Public Assembly, and of the complete and final rooting out of a whole secret society, seven thousand in number, of the punishments inflicted, and the decrees. We do not find anything more interesting in the course of Roman History than the account of this *cause celebre* in Livy, nothing that is more illustrative of the best qualities of Roman Justice.

In the city the Greek learned his fine Arts, his Poetry and his Eloquence. He learned also, in the city, in the agora and the dikasterion, to ruin his country. These Arts he completed in the space of one hundred years of Athenian city life. The Roman more slowly learned, in the city also, Law, and Equity, and Polity; to rule the Roman city, and organize it out of all the savage and barbarous elements he had to deal with, and thence to rule the European, Asiatic and African World, and *organize* it also. Hence the proud boast, and no less proud than true, of the rhetorical poet of the age and court of Augustus, that all Arts were inferior to this one gift—Sculpture, Poetry, Oratory, Science,—but small endowments compared with this one gift of *organizing* and *ruling* the European world, and making it a world of peace.

"Excudent alii spirantia mollius æra,  
Credo equidem; vivos ducent de marmore vultus;  
Orabunt causas melius; cœlique meatus  
Describent radio, et surgentia sidera dicent:  
Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento;  
Hæ tibi erunt artes; pacisque imponere morem,  
Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos."\*

The Roman understood his own gifts and his abilities. His

---

\* Virgil's *Æneid*, Lib. VI., 847.

work was to organize, under the Law, all the nations of Europe, Asia and Africa, all the world then known to man. He did the work, and the City was his centre of organization, his base of action.

The Roman world was first a Republic of cities, then an Empire of cities. Everywhere through Europe, Asia and Africa, there was the Roman, the master of the world, with his Roman Law, his aptitude for business, his splendid organizing talents. He was a soldier also, but only in a business way—only as a master of the police of the world. The ancient Spartan was a trained soldier by profession, nationally. The Gauls were a race of warriors above all the nations of the ancient world. Greece and Asia, and all Europe, felt the military frenzy of the Celt long before the Christian era, as all Europe has in these latter days under the first Napoleon. And it was only the two greatest of the Romans, Cæsar and his uncle Marius, who saved Rome from the Gaul. But the Roman valor was deliberate and civil altogether. The Romans were the tamers and civilizers of the world, and they fought, as policemen fight, in a steady, professional way, in the line of their business, and only when absolutely necessary.

Over all Europe their cities were placed, copies of great central Rome. Only think of Roman Carthage, built by Julius Cæsar, rising on the site of old Phœnician Carthage, which had been utterly destroyed and laid waste without inhabitant, and finally becoming a city of nearly five hundred thousand people upon the now desolate shores of North Africa. Look at Londinum, the Roman city, among the barbarous Britons,

"Toto divisos orbe Britannos,"

and think how great it must have been, when, at one time, seventy thousand Roman citizens were slain there by Boadicea. And then the German cities of Rome, the great French and Spanish Roman cities, and all through Asia Minor, onward towards the East, there were the Roman cities, centres of civilization to all around them. We give just one instance of the telling effect of this system of the Romans: here is Mauritania, now Morocco, a country six hundred miles long, and as many broad, the

western shoulder of Africa, sloping from the mountains towards the Atlantic, a huge corn-plain that might give food to millions, but is now covered with weeds. Its commerce is nothing now. It hardly supports its people, a rubbish of scattered and scanty Mohammedan tribes. It was once the granary of the world ; for it came into the hands of the Romans in the days of Claudius Cæsar. They organized it, in their manner, with Roman Cities, Colonies, *Municipia* and *Oppida Latina*, one hundred and seventy in all ; so that Christianity found so many cities in that land to put Bishops in. In the present Morocco there were once one hundred and seventy Roman cities and as many Christian Bishops, and the whole country is now desolate.

The organizing talent is God-like. The Organizer, in his power and in his work, is like to God, Who rules and over-rules, and, at the same time that He permits natural and moral freedom, guides and governs by His Providence, and brings out His good purposes and general blessings, not simply by natural laws, but by the natural constitution, the free action, the consent of man. The grandest it is of all gifts, the most God-like of all faculties and powers, individual or national.

In the individual man it is the rarest of gifts (as we have seen), the most admirable. Only once or twice, in the course of a thousand years, has any people the gift of a born Organizer, and then at once it stands upon its feet endowed with limitless strength and capacity. The soul of the man becomes the nation, and, henceforth and forever, all that people are his sons, his children, as if they had come from his loins ; and a sort of divine worship is given the man forever, a reverence, that strikes those without as extravagant and ridiculous, and yet, nevertheless, it takes possession of all minds in the nation, from the highest to the lowest.

A single instance, within the limits of a single nation, is almost worshipped. But what shall we say to a whole race organizing an entire world, European, Asiatic, African ? What shall we say to that great race, in which generation after generation, consul after consul, tribune after tribune, censor after censor, all had the same extraordinary gift ? A nation, in

which men, who, as statesmen or warriors, would stand out forever in modern European History, are but names in the great succession of born Organizers. A nation, with no intellectual powers, with no fine Arts, no Sciences, no Literature; a nation springing up in the midst of barbarism, not mentioned or named by the famous Greeks, and yet the more we know of them the more we wonder at their work and their place in History. They had the one gift, and this one made them the greatest and the grandest nation in the life, in the history of the world.

Now one thing does appear strange in regard to this national gift of the Organizing Power, and its origin. It does seem the gift of a mixed race. Look at the Greeks, with their glorious powers and talents. It seems as if they were not only without this faculty, but possessed with the very contrary tendency. Each little town and precinct is a republic, and so restlessly fighting every other, so endlessly involved in sedition and faction, that the Historians and Philosophers of Europe make up their mind that Democracy is destructive, and tends to anarchy, and are astonished at a Democracy spreading over a continent, that has most intensely the feeling of unity. Democracy is disunited, intensely individual and disorganizing; "therefore," says solemn Lord John Russell, in the English Parliament, "it is not the desire of union, but simply the lust of dominion and conquest that actuates this American Democracy." The Greeks were an unmixed race—Hellenes, whether Ionian or Dorian—of one family.

Look then at these Romans, how mingled in blood and race they were—first, the grave sober *Prisci Latini*, by the Tiber; then, the Pelasgian rovers and Greek pirates, from the sea, the rugged Sabine and Samnite emigrants, the Tyrrhenian conquerors, with their mixed blood of Asiatic descent; and finally the Celtic conquest—more of a mixed race of kindred blood there could not be.

Now let us take our own people. Is there more of a composite people in the world? The English talk of us as their descendants, and yet, as far as we can make out, there is not more than thirty per cent. of English blood. Irish and German, we believe, preponderate over English, and then all the other Japhetic

racess have come in in masses ; Dutch here, Huguenot-French there, Scotch-Irish in one State, and Swedes in another—Canadian-French, Italians and Spaniards. There cannot be less than one hundred and fifty thousand Swedes, Norwegians and Danes, in the West, at this date. There are through the country large settlements of Welsh, of Belgians, of Swiss, and of Bohemians of the true Slavonic race, and, most curious of all, the Jews are coming over in large numbers,—fifty thousand of them in the City of New York—large numbers of them in every city of the West and East, and they are mingling their blood in the American stream, in a way one hardly thinks of. The writer of this Article knows at least twenty families who are partially of Jewish blood. Dutchman, Jew and New Englander, commingled, make an unrivalled native American, either in the State, or in the Church. Our race is forming of many elements, a new race in a new land. Our democratic principles, our great cities, our freedom as regards landed property (would we could say our commercial freedom !)—all these are moulding the many elements into one people.

And, while no drop of German blood went to the composition of that great Roman race, and our people are being formed under circumstances so utterly different, yet it is strange what points of similarity there are in these two nations ; a business people they were,—and so are we,—of immense resource and pliability, and yet of immense tenacity. The Gaul is now, as in the days of Julius Cæsar, a gossip and a news-monger. The German to this day is wrapped up in his domestic happiness and his philosophy. But the Roman was essentially a politician. He thought and spoke of *Res Urbis* and *Orbis*, the politics of Rome and the world, incessantly. He had also a supreme taste for Law, both in theory and practice. We ask, is not this an American gift ? Can we not see all these, even in our young boys at the Common School—the gift for Law, the intense interest in Politics, National and European, the taste for Writing and Debating, and the power and talent of taking part in public meetings of every sort and description ?

But all this business, and legal, and political, ability in the nation is far inferior, in fact merely subordinate to their gift of

Organizing. It needs to have been in the West for a time, to have cast your eye over the forest, or the treeless prairie without inhabitants, and then for a few years to have seen the native and foreign masses of labor flung upon them—each individual free and working for himself, and yet all under the Law, all in peaceful concert, urging on the common good; and then again, to see huge cities rising, twenty or thirty years doing for them, in this great West, the work that in Europe requires centuries—trade after trade, occupation after occupation, coming into existence in them—all wants supplied, all necessities satisfied—and, over all this restless energy, this force and hurrying enterprise, the native American Organizer presiding, controlling and guiding, with the American Constitution and the American Law in his hand.

We suppose no one at the time thought how great the Roman people was. It required their work to be done in this world, finished and completed, before men could have time to think and know how great it was, how great the ability that did it, and how seldom seen in men or nations. We believe no European now can understand how great this work is that the American people is doing, in *organizing* a new world, whose federal parts are great nations, and each of them, in the Roman fashion, a living image of the whole. Nay, we ourselves, who see it in the dust, and smoke, and turmoil of the present, know not how great it is,—but we know, that in our people is the gift for doing this work in all its parts and portions. The Organizing Power is in the native American of the United States, as it has never been in any modern nation of Europe—never in any people save the Roman race, lords of the European, Asiatic and African world.

We may take any profession, public or private, any public work to be done—the army or the navy, finance or commerce—anything, in short, in which the power of combining, controlling, guiding, is requisite, let it be as great as it may be, as delicate, as manifold and various, as long and tedious; and we will step into any one of our great cities, New York, or Chicago, or Philadelphia, or St. Louis, and we shall find, among our ordinary merchants and lawyers, men who have the

Organizing power in the highest degree, men who can set a-going and keep a-going the business of an Ocean or a Continent : and, furthermore, we see that the same power and talent are visible in the whole race, as it was in the Roman people.

But the English, whose language we inherit, have no gift for Organization. In fact, they rather detest the idea. They hate what they call abstract ideas, those grand cöordinate thoughts and clear principles that underlie Roman Civilization, and were, as it were, the plans and specifications, according to which the world-builders worked, generation after generation. But the idea of the Englishman is, that the individual man, his interests and passions, according to the circumstances of the day, and in conflict with the power that be, are the best shapers of national destiny. The nearest idea the Englishman has to a principle, is a compromise. "You fight me, and I fight you, until we come to a dead-lock, and neither of us can stir ; and then you must give up a little, and I must give up a little, and so the thing can move on—somehow, or anyhow, it will move on—and that we call a compromise." The English Polity is a succession of such conflicts, and the English Constitution is a clutter or muddle of such compromises ; no mortal man can tell how many in number they are, and how they tell upon one another and the Law. For which important facts the scientific explanation is, that the Constitution of England is unwritten. In fact, the English have no Organizing Power ; and, but that they are girded by the sea, isolated from the Continent of Europe ; but for their intense spirit of personal freedom ; but for their Church reading the Scriptures constantly in the audience of the people, in their own language ; but for their industry and business powers, which are immense ; and lastly, but for the manifest fact that, since the Reformation, God has held the nation in the hollow of His hand for His own purposes in the European world—the nation must long since have gone down, and been overthrown : for a nation, more destitute of this great power, considering its other extraordinary gifts, there is not.

In the State, things are got along with by compromises somehow, but in the Church, for hundreds of years, there has been



the most absurd work. Only imagine a Parish being the freehold of a clergyman ! Only imagine the state of that Law, that, in a Parish of, say fifty thousand people, in the Church of England, shuts out all her own Clergy (save two or three), and gives perfect and absolute freedom to Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Baptists or Methodists, as many of them, and as much and often as they please ! The Law that admits a foreigner, a Roman Catholic Priest, upon his conforming, to benefices in the English Establishment, and yet utterly excludes her own native born subjects, if ordained with her own Colonial orders ! The Law that orders the Dean and Chapter to elect a Bishop, and yet confiscates their goods, and imprisons them if they elect any one but the Government nominee ! The Law that establishes the Church in England, Presbyterianism in Scotland, and would undoubtedly establish Popery in Ireland, or Calvinistic Methodism in Wales, if it were pushed hard, and that certainly did at one time establish Hindooism in India ! The Edinburgh Review says, that an Englishman, of the name of Place, a Commissioner in Hindoostan, once elected Wardens and Vestrymen for Juggernaut ! And, lastly, that precious Law, which now enables Roman Catholic, Infidel or Jew, to legislate for the Church of England ! And that makes the final Court of Appeal, for all causes in the Church, to be a Committee of Privy Council, of which not one person need be, of necessity, a baptized member of the English Church ! And the reigning spirit in that Court, in a late most important case, was actually Lord Campbell, a Scotch Presbyterian ! The want of consistency, unity, combination and principle, in short, of all power of ORGANIZATION, is very manifest in all English Legislation, but, most of all, in everything that concerns their Church.

And we have suffered from it here. The old Roman organized his colonies, so that each city was modelled after Rome, the central city. They had the Roman Law, and were Roman citizens, with all the rights and privileges appertaining. The Church of England was Episcopal, but England kept her Church in the Colonies without Bishops, without Episcopal Government, without Law, in every way unorganized.

Now let us look, as Americans, to what we call the religious world in this land. Is it not essentially the continuation of the English religious world of this day? What is its deficiency? This one—it is *unorganized*; forms of Church Government mingled together and confused; unsteady in principle and in action—the Church, Romanism, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism—eighty different Denominations, great and small. Again, forms of doctrine—the Prayer Book, the Westminster Confession, the Synod of Dort, the Decrees of Trent, the Saybrook Platform, Unitarian, Universalist, Mormon, Swedenborgian Doctrines, all huddled up in one mass, oftentimes ten or twenty different forms of belief professed in one village, and many times the professors do not know their own doctrine, that is written upon their standards. And then, look at the effect of this in the dozen or twenty starveling societies in every little village, East and West, where there might be one or two flourishing Churches—in the strife and enmity, that arise from the competition of sects—in the waste of men and money in this wretched competition—in the impression made against Christianity, and the increase of unbelief—in the indistinctness of Christian Faith and Principle—in the vast opportunity given to hypocrisy, and cant, and sectarianism!

And then, side by side with all these wretched evils, put the one great and most blessed fact, that Religion is free from the State, that the Government of the United States is the first Government, since the world began, that does not tyrannize over Religion, the first that warrants and assures to every man the right of worshipping God according to his conscience, and, therefore, gives absolute freedom, uncontrolled, before the Law. Put to this one great fact, the other, that, among those who do profess Religion, there is actually more sincerity of belief, more real earnestness, more generosity in contribution to Religion at home and abroad, than is to be seen in any country of the European world. And what is it that is wanting to this religious world, so full of personal virtues and personal faith, so deficient in unity of doctrine, of worship, and of action? This alone is wanting—ORGANIZATION.

The most perfect Organization that ever was seen, was that of the Christian Church, before Constantine. It insured the progress of Christianity over the whole world, its increase in numbers, and, at the same time, in Faith and Holiness. There was in it a perfect Religious Government, and yet ambition had no place and no opportunity; the lust of power was checked and bridled. In every city were the Apostle or Bishop, the Presbyters in their Congregations, the Deacons under the Bishop, as his ministers in his work, and the whole body of the laity were co-partners with the Clergy in legislation and government: and thus all the works of love and faith were done abundantly and steadily in that city; the systematic and kindly alms-giving to the poor and desolate; hospitals for the sick, that noblest work of Christian love, unheard of among the heathen, first invented by Christian benevolence; the instruction and catechizing of the young; the burial of the dead; all these grand enterprises of goodness going on at once in all the pagan cities of the ancient world. The Church in the city, thus organized, absorbed within itself, generation after generation, whatever was noble and kindly in temper, or lofty in affection, or sublime and profound in thought, of the whole heathen world. It was the Kingdom of God upon the earth, and every baptized man or woman felt it so to be; a Kingdom, with a King invisible, yet of eternal power and majesty, ever present to the eye of faith. Under His Law they were doing His Works, in that foul heathen world, in His Faith. They knew, as it may well be doubted whether any Christians now know, what it was to be a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, "In order that they might shew forth the praises of Him Who had called them out of darkness into His marvellous light."\*

And then, just as beautiful and perfect as their Organization in the city, was their Organization in the State. We know that the Roman Empire was an Empire of cities. It conquered all the known world first, and then in the grand development, of which Julius Cæsar was the first great representative, all lands around the Central Sea became one country under the Roman

---

\* I. Peter ii, 9.

Law. And each European, Asiatic and African country became an integral part of that Great Empire. The division of the Empire, therefore, was Italy and the Provinces. A country, subject to the Government of Rome, and an integral part of the Empire, not the State, was strictly a "Province."\*

This was the exact use of the word in the time of Augustus. Afterwards it seems to have changed its meaning, and, in the time of Arcadius and Honorius, to have assumed somewhat of the present notion—that is, of a subordinate portion of a kingdom greater than a country, and of use for administrative purposes. In early days it was a State, which was a part of the Empire. Egypt, for instance, under Augustus, was a 'province,' under Honorius it contained six 'provinces.' Asia was one province in the one era, ten in the other; Gallia (not France simply, but the land of the Gaulish race) was first one province, then three, then seventeen. By this it will appear, that the first idea of the province corresponded exactly with our idea of a State, as regards ourselves, and meant a State in and under the great Roman Empire. And when we look at the Councils, we find them conforming to this idea rather than to the other. We see, for instance, in the Arian controversy, all the Bishops of Egypt meeting together, instead of merely those of the *Provincia* of that day in which Alexandria was placed. We can go over the early Provincial Councils, and shew that they were rather Councils of the integral parts of the Roman Empire, the *Provincia* of the earlier period, than of the *Provincia* of the later. The one corresponds to the State in our great Empire; the other more strictly is the modern European Province.

Now we find the Organization of the Christian Church, as it had first the "See," and thus took possession of all the cities, the centres of civilization in the Roman Empire, its Bishoprics being always in the city, and named from the city, and there being in every city, great or small, a Bishop; so in every divis-

---

\*"The term 'Provincia' was used to express a territory beyond Italy, which had a regular organization, and was under Roman administration. When a conquered country was constituted a 'Provincia,' it did not become, to all purposes, an integral part of the Roman State; it retained its national existence, though it lost its (independent) sovereignty."—GEORGE LONG.

ion of the Roman Empire, Christianity was organized in such a manner that the Bishops, and Clergy and Laity, of every country, met and consulted for the common interest. We find Councils of Egyptian, of Gaulish, of German, and Spanish Bishops. And thus the force and influence of the Church over the whole Empire was by this means equalized. The little city in the mountains, or in the desert, has its Bishop; but it is not left to its own resources; for by means of the "Provincial" or "State Organization," the Church in a whole country, having a common interest, extended its powers over the whole region. The cities, great and small, in that country, may be taken as the brain and the great ganglions of the Church, nervous centres from which the whole life and energy of the Church work. But the Church and the people in the whole State, Egypt, Gaul, or Britain, or Spain, or Palestine, are one. And they have for the whole an Organization, wherein Bishops, Clergy and Laity meet from the whole country, and consult for it all. In this Council of the whole, irregularities, personal, official, and organic, were corrected, and justice done in the case of appeals. Mutual arrangements between the Dioceses were made in it, and all inconveniences that arose obviated.

Now, we ask our readers to look at this matter, and consider what it was that gave victory to Christianity, and converted the nations of Europe. First, we will say, the Gospel, the heavenly and healing Truth in the hands of the preacher, Apostle, Bishop or Deacon; and next the Kingdom of Heaven, the Divine Organization upon earth adapted to the nature of man, to all his wants and all his natural habits in this world,—the Truth, and the Organization upon earth carrying out the Truth—the Gospel and the Church, or, more properly, the Gospel in the Church. A grand and glorious revelation is made, in its ultimate and consummate perfection, by God manifest in the Flesh, the everlasting Son of God, the Word Incarnate—a revelation that reaches and satisfies all man's wants, that explains all the problems of his humanity, that gives a solution to every question concerning himself, his relation to his fellow-men and to God, that has been put to man from the earliest ages to the latest time.

And then the Kingdom of Heaven, starting from obscure, despised Judea, takes possession of the whole Empire with an actual visible Organization, which outvies in wisdom the Roman Power. Age after age, for eight hundred years, had the wise Roman been building up his Dominion and his Law. And then at last, through the greatest mind of all the race, had come the thought, "that war and conquest must have an end. The world must become one Empire at last, and universal and perpetual peace ensue ; each nation a part of that great Empire, under one great Law." Caesar was slain, but his ideas, every one of them, were fruitful, and were carried out ; and the world at last was completely *organized*. And lo ! the Kingdom of Heaven stands forth, confronting the kingdom of earth. It has the final and ultimate Truth for man. It has that Truth also written in a Book, the unchanging verity of a written revelation. With this it faces the Roman Power, which is the Kingdom of the world, and all the grandeur of its heathen wisdom. It has also its own Organization upon the earth, as the Kingdom of Heaven. As keenly as the Roman, did it understand the value of Cities as centres ; Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria, great Rome itself, Corinth, Thessalonica, Babylon—all these received forthwith the Apostle or Bishop. And, once established in these cities, the grasp was never given up—Bishop after Bishop might be slain, torn from the Church by the most cruel death,

"Sed uno avulso, haud deficit."

The man was slain, but the Bishop was there in the city, the Apostle of God's Church, once and forever. The rapid succession of our Bishops and Martyrs, in the early Church, is perfectly astonishing. In fact, at Jerusalem, there were forty Bishops down to the time of Eusebius, an average of only five or six years to each Episcopate ! Indeed, the sagacity with which the early Church seized upon the city as the See, and the tenacity with which She held on to it, are most astonishing, and the courage and boldness, with which, generation after generation, they maintained their seat (Cathedra) are almost miraculous. The Roman himself did not understand the value of cities to civilization, more than the Christian comprehended

their worth and work in the extension and propagation of the Gospel.

In fact these three, the Apostle, or Bishop in the City, the Cathedral or Bishop's Church, as the centre, visible and manifest, of all the work of the Gospel in the city, and the Council of all the Sees within a given "*provincia*," the unit of the Roman Empire, as the State is of our new world, are the essential elements of all Church Organization, all Church growth and progress.

These are the same, at this day, as they were in the Roman Empire. These three are the only means, whereby the Bishop, the Priest, the Deacon, the Layman, are given full power of laboring for the Church of Christ freely, with all the strength that is in them ; all the zeal, the faith, the holiness, that they have,—the only means whereby one and all the elements of universal humanity are made to work together for Christ. ORGANIZATION causes the whole machine to move freely, without friction, or jar, and without noise. It distributes the power equally to the remotest part ; by means of it the greatest effort and the smallest are done alike. A manifold and complicated machine, of multiform parts, and doing the most varied work in the best way, because of the mutual cöordination of all. Such is a Government well organized. Such was the great Roman Empire when Christianity came into the world ; and such, also, in a most wonderful degree, was the Christian Church before the era of Constantine. And these were its elements,—the Bishop or Apostle in his See, the Cathedral, and the State or Provincial Council.

The English Church, from her slavery to the State, gave her subjects, in the colonies, no Church Organization, no Bishops, no Cathedrals, no Councils, no Church Courts, or Church Law ; nothing, in fact, by which unity might be maintained, and progress insured. All the sects were perfected by their own constitutional right of voluntary action. The establishment of the Church in England crippled us here. By it, the Church in the Colonies was kept imperfect and unorganized. Only in England could our clergy be ordained ! No Bishop visited the Colonies ! If a man, or woman, or



child, in New York, Boston, or Philadelphia, wanted to be confirmed, he had to go to London ! We were, perforce, under Congregational Organization and ideas, both Parishes and Clergy. And so unused had we become to our own principles, that, after the Revolution, one State consented to unite with the others in the application for the Episcopacy, only on condition that she should have no Bishop !

We obtained the Episcopate. Was it owing to ourselves, or to the way in which England had left the Church, in the Colonies, for hundreds of years, that, for a long time, the Bishop was looked upon as a sort of supernumerary, a minister whom it was necessary to have for nothing but to confirm and ordain—a kind of Corinthian capital, more ornamental than useful to the Church, which is the pillar of the Truth ? The feeling of self-existence, the progress of life and growth, began to put an end to this theory of the Episcopate. Councils were, at once, restored under the awkward and unfitting name of Conventions. The wisdom of Bishop White,

“*Mitis sapientia Læli,*”

restored the Laity to their conciliar position, which they had in Nicene times, and secured us against the Romanist and Methodist mistake of an exclusively clerical legislation. And the energy and decision of Seabury gave us a Prayer Book, more free from faults, to say the least, than that of the English Church. And so we obtained the main elements of the Church, the Episcopacy, the Church tradition in the Prayer Book, a *Conciliar Organization*.

What did we want then ? First, the sense and feeling of what the Episcopacy really is,—that it is not a mere ornament, but the Apostleship of the Church, the ministry itself, instead of being a new adjunct to a congeries of Congregational parishes, an order of functionaries to ordain and confirm when called upon. This conviction also was arising, slowly, but surely, among the better class of Clergy and Laity. But we were wholly wanting in the sense of the relation the Episcopate bears to the city. We did not in any way know its value. Absolutely we had no idea, at all, that the Episcopate ought

to be in the city, to be called from the city; that the city was just as necessary a basis of Church progress, and of the growth of the Christian Religion in every way, as of civilization. We were excusable in this, as being originally scattered Clergy and Laity of the Church of England in her Colonies, who had been compelled by England to live as Congregationalists, without the Episcopate, without Councils, without Cathedrals.

When we were in this way deficient, through the fault of England, and the traditions of England, the self-consciousness of a living and working Church supplied us with the feeling of our wants,—and this REVIEW (we are proud of the fact, and exult in it) first held up to the Church the truth which we had forgotten. In October, 1857, we printed an Article upon the See-Bishopric. In that Article we shewed that the Episcopate was always in the city from the earliest times of the Gospel—that this is seen, even in the New Testament. The Angel (Apostle or Bishop) of each one of the Seven Churches was in the city, his Church named after the city, and not, as we had named it, after the territory. We shewed that, from the earliest times, all over the world, down to the present, this had been the only way of naming the Diocese and the Bishop; and that we had been the first and only Apostolical Church that had done otherwise. And then we shewed how appropriate it is to place the Bishop in the city, the central office of all administration and government in the Church in the centre of civilization and progress, of population, money, and ideas.

Our Article supplied a want, it pointed out the way, and multitudes in the Church felt its truth. In fact, we may say it began a movement which is now most powerful in the Church. The experience, the knowledge, the conviction of the Clergy and Laity of the Church everywhere, North and South, East and West, agree with and confirm our doctrine. They know that the Bishop, in the See, is the centre of growth and progress; and, therefore, there are, at this present time, making ready for application to the General Convention, at least nine several Episcopates. We hope that they will hold to the principle. We hope that no Episcopate will be named

henceforth territorially; that the only remains of the old title will be, that, as in the Council of Nicæa, we find the Bishops of Egypt, of Spain, of Gaul, of Britain and Palestine, the old provinces of the Roman Empire in the sense we have pointed out ; so only shall we have the Bishops of New York, Virginia, and Ohio, and of all the other States.

But the great proof to us that our Article told, that God had given us the peculiar grace to open up a new work, to lead the mind of the Church in this great land to the old system of the Catholic Church, was the last General Convention and its consequences. The territorial system had been ours, one and uniform and unbroken. We had no Episcopate, from the beginning, called after a City. And the sense and conviction of the Church prevailed over the strongest of all feelings, that of system and precedent. As the result of that Convention, the See-Bishopric *has entered into the Church as a fact*. The Diocese of Pittsburgh is the one great argument, the one great instance that takes us out of theory into constitutional precedent and authority. This one fact opens up the possibility, nay, the certainty, of the whole Ancient System. Brooklyn and Albany, Cleveland and Wheeling, and Annapolis and Baltimore, Washington and Reading, and Utica and Rochester—all can follow this precedent, and every city in the United States finally have its Bishop. The Diocese of Pittsburgh has done that for the Church.

And to show how this system of the See is the system of the Catholic Church, legally and constitutionally, we give here, as not cited before in our other paper, the enactment of the Nomocanon, the code of Law, to this day, of the Eastern Church :—"Let each city (*ἐκαστη πόλις*) have its own Bishop (*ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον*), and if, by means of a rescript of the Emperor, any one should dare to deprive the city of its Bishop, or its Diocesan Territory, or any other right, he is deprived of his benefice (*γυμνοῦται τῶν ὀντων*), and degraded from his rank (*αἰτιοῦται*)." This is the law of the Greek Church, in a Code which is now one thousand years old. And the fact, in the Roman Empire, is thus stated by St. Cyprian :—"Cum jam-

---

\* Martyred, A. D. 253.

pridem per omnes provincias, et per urbes singulas, ordinati sunt Episcopi." "*Long since, through all the Provinces and the the cities severally, Bishops have been ordained.*" These are most valuable citations, shewing the law and the fact in the Roman Empire, of the See-Bishopric, and the Provincial System. They are to be found in Keble's Hooker.\*

But we now urge the See-Bishopric upon the Church, not as an isolated notion, not as a sectarian or denominational thing—but as merely one element of the great system of the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, the Kingdom that is to conquer the world. We urge it simply as one of the elements of Organization in the Church. These are three in number :—First, the Apostle or Bishop in the city, having his See (*Sedes or Cathedra*) there ; secondly, the Cathedral system, the Bishop's Church, in every city ; and thirdly, the Provincial System, the system of Ecclesiastical Federation or Synodical Union, within the region that corresponds to the *Provincia* in the old Roman Empire.

We urge this one great system, in its three-fold perfection, in behalf of the Church herself, and her increase and progress in this great land. In behalf of this present Protestant Christianity, so broken and fragmentary, so full of prejudice, mistakes and misapprehensions, and yet so abundant in personal faith, and energy, and liberal free-handed zeal. And in behalf of humanity itself, which, in our great cities, is beginning to suffer the unutterable woes that poverty suffers in the great cities of Europe. We say, give us the power to organize the Church as in days of old, and our Bishops, our Clergy, our Deacons, our Laymen and Laywomen, will do, in our cities, the work that was done of old, and is now but poorly done by Protestant Societies and Romish Monastic Orders.

We call upon the Church, in her Great National Council, her General Convention, for these elements, this system of Organization, in behalf of the one nation that has the most business ability, the most organizing power, of any nation in the world, since the Roman people ; perhaps, more even than

---

\*Keble's Hooker, Eng. Ed., Vol. III, p. 184.

they. We say, Organize the Church by the See-Bishopric, the Cathedral System, the Synodical System, and, at once, you open endless progress to the Church, union to all American Christianity; and to all humanity a new era in all our cities; to poverty, disease and distress, once more the great work done by the *Organized Christianity* of each city, that of itself won the world to Christ.

And this we ask, that the Church may have it in her power to avail herself of the peculiar gift of the nation, the gift of Organization. We ask that the Church should make the See, the Cathedral, the Provincial System, her own, in order that the men who have the great national gift of organizing, administrative and executive ability, may have room and freedom to work for Christ; a basis for their peculiar abilities in the City and in the State, that they may be enabled to work for the Gospel in this land, as God has given them the talent.

This is the great business of this next General Convention. In the first place, to remove all obstacles to the See movement; to put our Constitution and Canons in such a position, that the Churchmen of every city may be enabled to elect their Bishops, to build their Cathedral, and thus to establish their local centre for Church work, of all kinds, in that city and the region round about. And next, we look for an arrangement, whereby all the Bishops and Dioceses of a given region, whether it only comprises the State, or more States than one, in extraordinary cases shall be enabled to combine in common work, Missionary, Educational and Philanthropic, over the whole region.

In order to do this, we ask first, that all obstacles, in the way of this action, be removed from our Constitution and Canons; and secondly, that our General Convention leave us no more under Congregational and Presbyterian ideas; but that they *solemnly recognize* and *set forth* our System in its elements and in its cöordinate unity—the Bishop or Apostle in the city, called from the city, residing in the city, with his See-House there, and his Church there.

And again, the Bishop's Church, his Cathedral, the beauty of holiness in worship and in work, the model Church to the

City and Diocese, of Liturgic Worship, of Church Music, of all the offices of Christian devotion, the centre of Christian benevolence, of good works among the poor, and sick and diseased; the centre, also, of Christian education, the Church to which the orphan and the widow will look forever with the eyes of hope and faith in Christ, and of thankfulness to their Father in Heaven. We want a clear acknowledgment and setting forth of this great element, this grand local realization of the Kingdom of Heaven upon earth; this local habitation, which places the Bishop at once in his true position upon earth, as the Apostle of Christ to a sinful and miserable world; which makes him, as in the days of old, the Angel of the Church in that city.\* We want the Cathedral fully recognized, in our Constitution and Canons, as a Church element and a Church centre in our system.

And then we want all these centres of the Faith coördinated as in the days of old, in a system like to the ancient provincial system, a system whereby, through all the regions of the land, the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity may, *nay, must*, meet together, and do one general work in that region,—the Provincial System of the Primitive Church. All these should be recognized, in our Constitution and Canons, as our System—all impediments to its development done away, all freedom given, and the whole coördinated canonically, so that all shall work together as *one well Organized Constitutional System*; and thus, as the Church of God in this land, we shall, at last, have the power to do the work that is before us, of uniting all Christianity in the body of one Church, in the profession of one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.

Any one that aids in this work is simply helping on the grandest and the best work that the world has ever seen. Any one that impedes it, whether he knows it or not, is laboring to increase the present disorganization and anarchy of all Christianity that is not Roman Catholic; is keeping the Church disjointed, unorganized and feeble, and is promoting

---

\*The Seven Stars are the Angels of the Seven Churches.—Rev. i. 20.

the growth and progress and dominion of Romanism in this land. For the Roman Catholic Church understands the value of the See. She will shortly have a Bishop in every city of the land. She knows the value of the Cathedral. Everywhere Roman Cathedrals are rising in our cities, and around them Schools, Hospitals, Orphan Houses. This fact of the Cathedral puts all others as denominations, their Churches as conventicles, their ministers as mere party leaders of a day. Rome knows the value of the Old System of the Church ; and as all the old Churches of the East and the West, even our Mother Church of England, have this system, so has Rome ; and here, in this land, she is now using it most energetically.

And, we forsooth ! through the sin of England towards our forefathers, and from our own folly and weakness, having the Church, and the Faith, and the Holy Scriptures, and the Episcopate, are content to be Congregationalists in fact, to remain unorganized and crippled, unable to do the duty that we manifestly have towards this great land.

We say plainly, that to restore and recognize our System, in all its elements, and in its cöordinate unity, this is to do the *greatest work for the Reformation that has been done upon the earth*. It is to shew the world that the work of Cranmer and Latimer and Ridley has not failed ; but that, as they thought, there can be a Christianity *Catholic*, but *not Roman*, pure in doctrine, holy and uncorrupt in life, with the Bible open and read by all, full of life and energy, and full of the spirit of unity and progress. This is what we may be to *this country* and to *the world*.

But, if we remain without the System of the Church, as we are, the disorganization of Protestant sects continues and increases. Rome, having these elements of power, gains in our cities increase of means, of population, of influence ; and, finally, we have the Romish lust of dominion and wealth on the one hand, and the lawless, godless spirit of unbelief on the other, producing among us the evils that they have in Europe for almost a thousand years. Every one, therefore, we say, that urges on the acceptance and the acknowledgment of the



Church System, its completion and organization, is preventing enormous evils for this land; is conferring upon it and upon the world illimitable blessings, whose magnitude and glory God only knows. And every one that stands in the way, and attempts to retain us in our present unorganized state, is simply laboring in behalf of religious disorganization and unbelief, and anarchy of doctrine and of morality first; and then is acting in behalf of the Roman Bishop in every city as against our own; and of Romanism, and all its evils and corruptions, political and religious, over this great land.

## ART. II.—THE DECLARATION AND THE ADDRESS.

THE importance of the crisis in the history of the Church in America, indicated by the following DECLARATION and ADDRESS, can scarcely be exaggerated. Their trace is to be left deeply on Her Future. At the risk of occupying greater space than can be well spared in our present number, it has been concluded that both these papers should be preserved in the more permanent pages of the REVIEW. Nothing can so well set forth the difference between the CHURCH, and the party which would rend or revolutionize Her.

A DECLARATION OF CERTAIN CLERGY AND LAITY  
OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

"The subscribers to the following Declaration, deeply moved by what they believe to be the present dangers of our beloved Church, in the open and secret tendencies which exist in it to conformity with the Church of Rome, and humbly trusting in the guidance and blessing of the Holy Spirit, would make this statement of their views and feelings, for the purpose of mutual encouragement and support.

The essential principle of these tendencies is an entire subversion of the Protestant and Evangelical character of our Reformed Church. It transforms the Ministry of the Gospel into a Priesthood; Baptism into a magical rite; the Lord's Supper into the Sacrifice of the Mass; evangelical liberty into bondage to manifold observances and ceremonies; and the One Church of Christ, "the blessed company of all faithful people," into the body of those who recognize and conform to a mere sacerdotal system.

These tendencies, already far advanced in England and in this country, are mutually aided by a subtler and less clearly pronounced sacerdotalism, which finds expression among us in an exclusive view of the Episcopal Church; in unscriptural conceptions of the sacraments; in superstitious ideas of the power of the ministry; and in a legal, rather than evangelical, view of the Christian life.

The influence of these tendencies we believe to be eminently injurious to our Church, by the reasonable prejudice which they excite; fatal to the performance of the great mission of our Church in this land, by their contrariety to true liberty and the true progress of the age; dangerous to souls by their hiding of the free grace of the Gospel; and dishonorable to Christ, by their substitu-

tion of human mediatorship in the place of the "One Mediator, Christ Jesus."

Under a deep sense of responsibility, we ask ourselves what, in this crisis, it is our duty to do?

In the first place, we feel compelled to affirm, that, in many of the pulpits of our Church, another Gospel is preached, which is not the Gospel of Christ. The Church needs to be awakened to its peril. A paramount duty is imposed upon our clergy and our Missionary Organizations, to see that, so far as they are able, the pure Word of God shall be preached every where in our land. We cannot yield this liberty and obligation to any claim of territorial jurisdiction, and we hereby express our sympathy with the resistance which is made, in this respect, to the attempted enforcement of false constructions of canonical law.

We believe, also, that the present crisis of Protestantism demands a higher degree of sympathy and coöperation among the various Evangelical bodies into which we are divided. An exclusive position, in this respect, we hold to be injurious to our own Church, and inconsistent with our history and standards, as well as with the spirit of the Gospel. In the case of those "chosen and called" to the work of the ministry by those "who have public authority given unto them in the congregation," and manifestly blessed in their labors by the Holy Ghost, we believe that we cannot withhold our recognition of the validity of their ministry, without imperiling the interests of Evangelical Religion, "despising the brethren," and doing "despite unto the Spirit of Grace." In this matter, also, we express our earnest sympathy with the resistance which is made to those false interpretations of canonical law, by which this recognition and fellowship would be restrained.

This statement of our views is made under a full sense of any responsibility which it may involve. The love and devotion which we bear to our Church, and the allegiance which we owe to Christ, will not allow us to hesitate. With kindness and charity for all who differ from us, imposing no burden upon the consciences of others, as we are unwilling to submit to any imposed upon our own, we claim only, that in the Church of our dearest affection it is our inalienable privilege to be true, in these respects, to our sense of duty to God.

#### ADDRESS TO THE CLERGY AND LAITY OF THE CHURCH THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES.

"We, whose names are hereunto subscribed, have formed an Association, under the title of the American Church Union, which we now cordially invite you to join. In giving you this invitation, it is due to you and to ourselves, that we should state the reasons which have led us to take this step, and, at the same time, to enumerate some of the advantages which, with the blessing of Almighty God, and under His protection, we hope to secure thereby.

The necessity for such an organization is asserted by the circumstances of the times. Social and moral evils increase and multiply on every hand. Multitudes of the young are growing up without religious education; through the press, the stage, and other agencies, the community is familiarized with scenes of lewdness, immorality and crime; the marriage contract is made contemptible in many parts of the country, by the facility with which it may be dissolved; the responsibility of the parental relation and the care of a family are to a great extent criminally avoided; the ordinances of the Gospel of Christ are disused, and the Public Worship of God is neglected. The Church, in whose divinely constituted system are contained the remedies for these and similar evils, is unable to meet the demand for her services, through lack of men and means enough to do the work which ought to be done.

But, while the aspect of the times thus calls us to put forth all our strength for God, for the Church, and for the Salvation of men, there has arisen within our fold an evil which threatens the subversion of our whole system. A movement has commenced, which, although confined to narrow bounds, and participated in by but few individuals, gives rise to just apprehensions, by the temper which it discloses, the rashness with which it is conducted, and the magnitude of the interests which it imperils. There are perhaps no principles of this Church more distinctly asserted, more thoroughly established, and better known and understood throughout the community as characteristic of our system, than those expressed in the Preface to the Ordinal, as follows:

"It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and Ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests and Deacons; which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as were requisite for the same; and also, by public prayer, with imposition of hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed in this Church, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination."

Our great divines have maintained these principles, by arguments so conclusive, that we have taken pleasure in publishing them to the world; our people have long regarded them as settled; very large numbers of ministers and laymen of the religious bodies around us have entered our communion, through persuasion of the correctness of our position in this behalf; and even our adversaries, far from misapprehending our views on these subjects, have incessantly reproached us for exclusiveness and illiberality in holding them. It is well understood, that in her canons and ru-

bricks our Church has drawn, between her own ministry and that of the denominations around her, a line of separation; that she recognizes none but Episcopal Ordination; and permits no one to officiate in any congregation, unless he be what she regards as a regularly ordained minister. (Canon 11, §1, Title I.) With similar care has she ordered, that "no minister belonging to this Church shall officiate, either by preaching, reading prayers, or otherwise, in the parish or within the parochial cure of another Clergyman, unless he have received express permission for that purpose from the minister of the parish or cure." (Canon 12, §6, Title I;) and, that "every minister shall, before all sermons and lectures, and on all other occasions of Public Worship, use the Book of Common Prayer, as the same is or may be established by the authority of the General Convention of this Church; and, in performing such service, no other prayers shall be used than those prescribed by the said Book. (Canon 20, Title I.) Under these regulations, and others, deliberately adopted, set forth by General Convention, assented to by the Clergy at their ordination, and well approved by the people, the Church has enjoyed peace within, and has rapidly extended her influence abroad.

There have been, and there are, however, individuals who have regarded, and do regard, these principles as erroneous, and these restrictions as oppressive; although, with strange inconsistency, or in inexcusable ignorance, they sought our ministry, and voluntarily submitted to its restraints. Such persons are not debarred from endeavoring to obtain relief by lawful means. Instead of taking that course, however, they attempt to effect what would be, if accomplished, a fundamental change in our system, and a repeal of most important canons, by methods without a precedent or parallel, in the history of this Church, for recklessness and injustice. Desiring a repeal of the laws, they treat them as if they were already repealed, and proceed at once to open, flagrant and persistent breach of them. To seek, by violence, results, for the attainment of which there has been provided a peaceable and orderly method; to forestall a decision, by seizing on what cannot be lawfully touched without it,—these are actions, not merely intolerable in their nature, but revolutionary in their issue. This is what is now done. The right is claimed of preaching anywhere, at pleasure, regardless of the protests of those who are canonically entitled to object; ministers of non-Episcopal communities are invited to officiate in our Churches; the intention is announced of breaking down every barrier between our Church and the religious bodies around her. If changes, so radical, as these appear desirable to any one, the proper way would be to seek them from the highest legislative council of the Church; but, as if it were felt that the lawful process would be too long, and more than doubtful in its issue, the shorter method is tried, of securing them by force, and of effecting the repeal of existing laws, by trampling them under foot, and defying the Ecclesiastical Authority to execute them. There can be no doubt what such proceedings mean;

their motive is self-will, their method is contemptuous assault of time-honored institutions, and their design is revolution.

The existence of such evils around us, and the rise of such a danger within our own household of faith, seem to justify, before God and man, our present action. We associate, as a Church Union, in order to do a conservative, defensive, and aggressive work. We unite, to maintain the Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship of the Church; to extend the knowledge of her principles and system; and to secure joint action in her defense. We pledge ourselves to yield her all loyal fidelity, to protect her Orders, Offices, and Liturgy; to assert her conservative principles against the false liberality of the day; and to secure the integrity of her catholic position, and the respect due to her laws. We are not party men; we combine for the advancement of no one set of interests or views; our platform is that broad one upon which all consistent Churchmen may stand. We desire to promote the advancement of true Church principles; to carry our distinctive Liturgical and Sacramental system to every corner of the land; to take decisive and adequate measures for the defense and protection of the Church; to uphold the canonical authority of the Bishops; and to procure respect for the laws. These are our objects; and behind them we conceal no personal designs, or sectarian or partisan ends. What we do, we intend to do frankly and openly; looking to public opinion to justify our consistency, and approve of our acts.

As a conservative association, the American Church Union will aid in upholding throughout this Church the supremacy of Law. We deny to no man, in any society, civil or ecclesiastical, the right to seek relief from what he deems to be grievances; but we insist that he shall do this in a proper way. Laws, while they exist, ought to be respected; their repeal may be sought, but it must be sought in an orderly manner. The strength of free communities lies not in standing armies, nor in centralized power, but in a wide and general respect for those laws, which they have made in their duly-elected legislatures, and to which they assent. It is to such a respect for law that the American people justly ascribe their security and attribute their prosperity; without it, our political system would ere this have fallen to pieces. But the same rule holds good in a Free Church; its safety depends on the observance of the Laws which its councils have enacted; and the duty of obedience is enforced by the consideration that the interests involved are not temporal but eternal. Nothing so rapidly demoralizes a community as the sight of open defiance of public authority; no State can bear it, nor can the Church. When, therefore, we behold our Canons deliberately broken, the principles of the Book of Common Prayer denied, the "godly admonitions" of the Bishop disregarded, and our household kept in agitation, by lawless, disorganizing and revolutionary proceedings, we deem it right, and our bounden duty, to use all suitable means of averting the dangers which impend, and of securing to the Church that respect

and consideration which, for the moment, seem in certain quarters to be lost.

As an aggressive body, the American Church Union intends to assert the principles of the Church, to extend the knowledge of her distinctive features, and to propagate her doctrinal, liturgical, and sacramental system, in a community ripe for its reception. The calls for her services and ministry were never so loud as now. By the public she is regarded as the exponent of a system, different from that of Rome on the one side, and that of the Protestant denominations on the other. It is, as a Reformed and Catholic Church, that she must address the men of this day. We aim to make her known in her true character, as a branch of the historic and visible Body of Christ; confident that, wherever she is so known, she will be respected and loved. Yet, while desiring to promote her growth and extend her influence, we hold that there should be room enough within her fold for widely different characters; that she should be comprehensive; that inside the lines, drawn by her rubrics and canons, great freedom should be allowed. We recognize the diversities of taste and temper, which must always exist among men; we would see provision made for them to any extent compatible with allegiance to principles and obedience to laws. We think that the Church should be inflexible towards the errors of the day, but at the same time indulgent to the legitimate desires, and studious of the reasonable wishes, of all within her fold.

As a defensive organization, the American Church Union intends to meet, with promptness, and in the manner which may appear most judicious and most apt to the end proposed, all attacks upon the Church, from without or from within; to test, if it be necessary, the sufficiency of our present means of discipline; and, if they should be found inadequate, to endeavor to secure, by regular and lawful methods, additional defenses for the Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship of the Church, as each may be successively threatened with detriment or destruction.

Having stated our objects, we now repeat the invitation to join us in the effort to accomplish them. We make this appeal, with confidence in the loyalty of the mass of our Laity as well as our Clergy. We believe that they agree with us, in the desire to maintain, unimpaired, principles which we have received from our fathers, which men, like Seabury, White, Griswold, Hobart, Doane, and Wainwright, defended in their writings and illustrated in their labors; that they share our opinion, that great damage to religion must ensue if the doctrines of the Church can be held in abeyance, and her laws defied with impunity; that they feel, with us, that the real glory of our Church has been her stability; that her conservative character exerts at this moment a powerful attraction, by which thousands are drawn toward her, and still greater numbers are constrained to honor and respect her; that in her communion many find peace and quiet, who revolt, in sickness of heart and in disgust, from the scenes of license and individualism else-



where presented. It is not surprising that anxiety and mistrust are felt by numbers of our people, who are justly astonished at the proceedings of those, to whom they looked for an example of constancy to duty and fidelity to engagements; and, therefore, it is most desirable to inaugurate, without delay, measures which may tend to restore confidence and peace.

We pray and seek for unity among ourselves, and amongst all the faithful in Christ Jesus; but we believe, that this is to be attained, not by sectarian alliances, based on negation, but by "maintaining the faith in its purity and integrity, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils, and by drawing each of us closer to our common Lord, by giving ourselves to much prayer and intercession, by the cultivation of a spirit of charity and a love of the Lord's appearing." (Lambeth Conference.) Having these ends in view, desiring to "abide steadfast in the Communion of Saints, wherein God hath granted us a place; seeking in faith for oneness with Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood; holding fast the Creeds and the pure worship and order, which, of God's grace, we have inherited from the Primitive Church;" (Lambeth Conference,) and inflexible in the resolve to sustain the Constitution, Canons, Doctrines, and Principles of this Church, as interpreted by Catholic Rule and Practice, we have organized, under a profound sense of duty, and with reference to the dangers of the hour; and, in now laying this statement before the Church, we solemnly commend our cause, as that of Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order, to the favor and protection of Almighty God, and pray Him to save the right and give peace in our time."

Let us now glance at the history and reasons of these antagonistic movements, and add a few brief comments. There are three great departments of Christian Labor, which, in a peculiar manner, belong to the Church. These are, the Education of Her Ministers, the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge among Her People. By Christ She was organized, and has been perpetuated, to accomplish these ends throughout the world. It is, perhaps, the misfortune of the American Church, that all enterprises having these objects in view, are not directly responsible to Her, and wholly under Her control. The Trustees of the General Theological Seminary, representing each particular Diocese, are appointed by the General Convention, to which they report and are amenable; and we would that every other such interest was in the same situation. This would eradicate the whole system of

Voluntaryism, and enable the Church, in the name of the Church, to do the work of the Church. But whatever foundation for independent and partisan societies may have been laid by our practices in other departments, the direction of the Missionary Enterprise is in the place intended by the Master. In the year 1835, the Church, rising to the majesty of Her position, declared herself, through Her General Convention, *One Great Missionary Society, of which every person, admitted within Her pale by Baptism, becomes a member.* The Foreign and Domestic Societies are now immediately and wholly under Her management. The very formation of an antagonistic Association, to accomplish the same work, is, therefore, in itself, the beginning of Schism, and can only be justified on the supposition of a corruption in truth or in morals, so hopeless, that a Reformatory movement is imperative. Nothing can possibly warrant such a step, but peril to the Gospel, and the souls of the people. In any other aspect, it must be viewed with reprobation and abhorrence. Only on such ground did the Reformers defend themselves before the tribunal of the world. Will it be claimed, that the Church in America has reached such a dark and fearful crisis? Has She perverted Doctrine? On the great question of Salvation through the merit of Christ, notwithstanding some formal disagreements, we have no doubt there is, essentially, a universal concurrence. Even the most extreme views of the Sacraments, held in our own country, having so strong a warrant in the expressions of the Prayer Book, and the writings of the Greek, and Latin, and Anglican Fathers, it will not be claimed, could authorize Schism. The Choral Service, practised in the old Cathedrals of England for centuries, and there sanctioned by the usage of all parties, can never be consistently condemned in America as Romish, by men who are impressed with its adaptation and solemnity in St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey. Ritualism kindles her altar-lights, and waves her censers, and attempts her splendors but in a single obscure Church, where, soon, unless she supports her claims, not by ceremonial, but by activities among the poor, pining, and neglected, she will, probably, be an occasion rather of commiseration than offense. Certainly, it will not

be contended, that the piety and morals of the Church are wholly corrupted, so that purity of heart and of life are confined to the members of partisan societies. Neither among them alone, can it be affirmed, burn the fires of Missionary zeal. Who accomplish, amid privations, suffering, and death, the work of God, in China and in Africa? Who are enduring toil, and encountering danger, and exhibiting the flames of an Apostolic Love, amid the prairies and mountains of the West, proclaiming the everlasting Gospel, and planting the Church, surrounded by blasphemous miners, and murderous Mormons? All plea for partisan enterprise in the MISSIONARY FIELD is removed, when we consider, that whereas, in 1835, the whole amount, contributed by the Church for Foreign and Domestic Missions, was \$33,879.75, the amount in 1867, for all purposes, including the Freedman's Commission, is \$221,109.53, the increase in the number of laborers being at least equal to that of the collections. That any corruption in the Doctrine or Practice of the Church, affording even a pretext for Schism, exists, is simply preposterous. Indeed, *collectively*, she was never so sound, so zealous, so successful. Now, under these circumstances, every movement based on the supposition that the Church is untrue, or unequal to Her Missionary work, must be, in its very essence, Schismatic. It is a public proclamation to the world of Her imbecility, or Her corruption. It is an admission before enemies, of which they are not slow to avail themselves. It is an arrogation of all piety, and all zeal, to a minority, which seems hardly reconcilable with Christian humility. It is a withdrawal of vast sums of money from the treasury of the Church, which are Her legitimate property, and might otherwise honor Her name, and extend Her influence, and accomplish Her work. But when these societies, perverted from their original design, become employed, not for the purpose of extending truth, but of producing division; when their chief members, upon annual occasions, proclaim that Law is to be repealed by its defiant violation; when they are willing to promote fellowship with Sects, by rending the unity of their own Household; when they show, that their sympathies are not with brethren, but with enemies; when, in other words, they

array themselves in open hostility to the Church, a time has arrived for bold, vigorous, and organized action. We lament the course of these erring men, in many instances influential by their position, and perhaps sincere in their blind, headlong partisan zeal. We wonder that they do not perceive, admitting even the errors they affirm, that their silent example of godliness, and their modest efforts of activity, in legitimate ways, would accomplish infinitely more for the good of the Church, and the glory of the Master, than noisy, turbulent, defiant, Schismatic association. We pray God they may be brought to milder measures, and a fraternal fellowship. But, persisting, painful as is the alternative, organization must be met with organization, energy must be met with energy, Schism must be met with Unity, rebellion must be met by Law; in other words, partisan effort to overthrow the Church, must be met by Christian effort to preserve the Church.

Whatever may be our abstract opinions of the propriety or expediency of organization, the question is practically settled, and every Churchman must choose between the radical sentiments of the Declaration, and the conservative principles of the Address. Surely, here can be but little hesitation. We sincerely hope, that the noble paper issued by the Committee of the Church Union, intended to perpetuate the Faith and Order of the Church, may never be perverted to any subordinate partyisms, but that the enterprise may always be preserved on its present broad, noble, and Catholic Foundation.

And it may not be amiss here to remark, that the Bishops, above all men, should avoid connection with the prevailing factiousness. Their relations are delicate and difficult. Their very position implies a certain dignified conservatism. They, in an important sense, represent, not themselves, but the Church. However their sympathies may incline them to fellowship beyond, rather than within, her precincts, still, they must remember, that they are peculiarly obnoxious, as perpetuating the Apostolic Succession. A high conception of their noble office, accompanied by a subduing kindliness of heart and manner, especially where they possess ability and zeal, everywhere commands a peculiar respect. But let them depart

from their sphere ; let them be ever so solicitous for popularity or usefulness without the Church ; let them even glow with an honest and commendable desire for a universal unity ; nay, let them make the most willing advances to the denominations they affect, still, it will be remembered against them, that, whatever their private professions, they are the men, who, by re-ordaining those previously commissioned by the various religious bodies, constantly, publicly, offensively, proclaim the invalidity of the hands of the Presbytery. They will be charged with hollow inconsistency, until they acknowledge in practice, as well as in theory, that the authority they exercise is not confined to the Episcopate. They will be called upon to lay down their office, and forsake the Church, rather than persist in contradictions so glaring. Let them remember, that the difficulty with the enemies of Episcopacy is not to the fact that our pulpits are exclusive, but to the *principle* that makes them exclusive ; and that, when these men speak of breaking down the barriers of Christendom, they simply mean, they intend overthrowing the ORDERS OF THE CHURCH.

We may add, in conclusion, that the hopelessness of the struggle resolved on in the Declaration, makes the violence with which it is prosecuted, still more inexcusable. Where is the growth of the Church ? Is it in Ohio, or is it in New York ? What Bishops, with an Apostolic fervor, are carrying her standard over the prairies of the west, and its high mountain barriers, to the shores of the Pacific ? Increase is the Law with those devoted to the Faith and Order of the Church ; and their overwhelming numbers, aroused by the Address, and the wide-spread organization to which it has given birth, renders resistance simply an absurdity. A toleration inspired by kindness and conscious strength, is often mistaken for weakness, but an assault on the flag of the citadel, arouses, in all its majesty, the power which had so long slumbered.

## ART. III.—BISHOP ELLIOTT.

At the beginning of the century, Charleston, S. C., was second to no city in America in its affluence of polite society. The gentlemen of advanced years, who had moulded her social life, were many of them Cambridge and Oxford men. Inheritors of vast wealth, with its gifts of elegant leisure and refinement, most of them had sacrificed their fortunes in the contest for American Liberty. Compelled thus in after years to struggle for subsistence and position, they had risen again to eminence. Theirs was a true nobility. Gentle birth and earnest disciplined life had been theirs. Returning opulence had restored to them their opportunities for literary and political studies. And they used them well; not for profit or for fame, but for their own satisfaction, for their families, for the society in which they moved; not to attract admiration, but to please and furnish themselves; not to astonish the world, but to refine and adorn their homes.

What was true of Charleston, was also true of the seaboard of Carolina, and perhaps nowhere more than in the town and district of Beaufort. The planters, as well as the men of a simply literary and professional life, were a high toned, honorable, gracefully cultured, thoroughly educated race, such as, nowhere in the same general proportion, is even there now to be found. Honor, however, rather than religion, furnished to them their rules of life. A remark often on the lips of the subject of this sketch, will vividly illustrate the peculiarities, in this respect, of the State in which he was born and the one in which he died. "In Carolina, I used to preach that morality without religion would not save men; in Georgia, I found I was obliged to preach that neither would religion without morality."

The father of Bishop Elliott removed from Beaufort to Charleston in 1812. He was distinguished among his compeers as an author, the founder and editor of the brilliant "*Southern Review*," and as a naturalist, especially versed in the science of

Botany. His wife was Miss Habersham, of Georgia. Thus were the honors of ancestry given to the States in which the Bishop's life was spent.

Rt. Rev. STEPHEN ELLIOTT was born August 31, 1806. He was six years old when Charleston became his home. He gives us a picture of himself in his boyish days, that is a presage of the coming man. He is speaking of the city library of Charleston.

"To that library I owed as a boy, and still owe as a man, unutterable gratitude. It seduced me from play and from idleness, and most of my spare time I spent curled up in its deep old window seats, among books and living men, from whom I derived invaluable stimulus."\*

We here see laid the foundation of future greatness. Then and there only, could have been begun, and, by perpetual avidity like this, been developed, that marvellous comprehension of learning that marked his maturer age.

He was a Sophomore in Harvard University, but finished his Collegiate course in South Carolina College, in 1825. In 1827 he commenced the practice of law in Charleston. Three years later he returned to his native place, to pursue the business of his profession as he intended, but in God's providence to meet that great change which was to determine his whole future career.

Misnamed, are most "revivals" of modern days. Yet such gracious influences as pervaded the town of Beaufort in 1831, all Christians must welcome. Till the Church fills up full with life her annual round of feast and fast, even she will hail a revival of holy zeal. "Revivals" have arisen in her history that even she has pronounced "genuine;"—calm and earnest in spirit, intelligent in progress, lasting in results. The evil has been, that men have tried to produce and increase the emotional phenomena of such scenes of special religious interest, as if in them alone the Spirit's Presence were evinced. Bishop Elliott always ascribed to this Beaufort revival, and the preaching of the Presbyterian divine, the Rev. Mr. Baker, his first abiding interest in the Christian Life. Yet we have heard him say that,

---

\* Address before the Georgia Historical Society, 1866.



so far as the Church was concerned, it was but the springing up of the seed sown far and wide in that community in the Church's services, by the ministry and preaching of the faithful and now venerable Presbyterian, still the beloved Rector of that Parish. In his mind this steady sowing of the seed was the appropriate duty of the ministry. With the modern revival system, he had little sympathy, and felt little confidence in its results.\* Certain "irregularities" in Beaufort were brought up in the South Carolina Convention. The substance of it was, that Dr. Baker had preached in the Episcopal Church. Bishop Elliott, then a lawyer, was one among others, fruits of that "revival," who arose and stated what had there been wrought in themselves and others. The proposed "inquiry" was dropped. We refer to this, for it has often been mentioned in that section of the country, as an instance of the beneficent effects of "union" meetings and of our Bishop's assent to such things. But such assent was not witnessed in his ministry or practised or encouraged in his Diocese. He never advocated or liked such a course. On the contrary, in his Convention address in 1859, he said, "the clergyman cannot unite in this course of things, because it would involve him in acts contrary to his ordination vows." And as to its effects, he has often been heard to lament the vast proportion of our population "lying out," "fallow," hardened and seared by the "revival" system to all further influences on that plan. And he was wont to assert the adapt-  
edness of the Church alone to reach and save this very class.

As a lawyer, Bishop Elliott would have risen to greatness. But as a Christian, he gave himself to the Lord, and was soon led to sacrifice his brilliant prospects and become a minister of

---

\* Bishop Elliott used to illustrate the working of the "revival" system, and contrast its results with those of the Church's system, by a reference to Savannah. When he first went to Savannah as Bishop, and Rector of St. John's church, there were not over 150 communicants in the city. The Methodists had at least 600. The latter had gone on with their revivals year after year, adding 50, 80, 100 at a time, and losing between while, as is their wont. The Church had gone on her quiet way, adding her yearly confirmation classes, "till now," said he in 1866, "we number 600 communicants and the Methodists are *just where they were*." And even this is understated. The actual number of the Methodists is found in 1867, by statistics, to be 550.

Christ. He was ordained Deacon in 1835, served one month in Welton, and then became Chaplain and Professor of Sacred Literature and the Evidences of Christianity, in South Carolina College.

It was a critical period in the history of that venerable institution. For fifteen years, the infidel, if not atheistical, president, Dr. Cooper, a man of restless spirit, intense energy, brilliant genius, wonderful attainments, extensive and intimate acquaintance with the celebrities of Europe, derived from personal contact, had done more perhaps than any one man in Carolina, to bring the Gospel into contempt. His election was by a majority of one vote only, and was rather the sign of the passing away of a generation of learned, skeptical men. He made no concealment of his opinions. On the contrary, he strove to impress them, nor hesitated to let his pupils see how he despised the Bible and its pretended Author. He would take his turn, nevertheless, in the College service, reading the Scriptures and going through the mockery of prayer. At length, in 1834, the long outraged Christian sentiment of the State demanded and effected his removal. Nor only so, but it was determined to teach Christianity, and its Evidences, as a part of the course of studies. "A noble literary institution was now to have emblazoned upon its portals the significant inscription, 'the Christian's God alone is worshipped in these walls.'"<sup>\*</sup>

Dr. Wm. Capers, afterwards the celebrated Methodist Superintendent, was first elected to the chair of the new Professorship, but never accepted it. Professor Elliott was the first to undertake the duties of that responsible office. For four years and more, he taught the Christian Religion, from the pulpit and from his chair, and, most effectively of all, illustrated it in his calm and beautiful life. The dishonored Gospel became again enthroned in the halls of science. The young men recognized its claims and felt its power. His successor was the famed Dr. Thornwell.

Two extracts from Mr. Hanckel's exquisitely tender and appreciative memoir, give us a portrait of the outward and the inward man at this period.

---

\* LaBorde's History of S. C. College.

"Long of limb and tall of stature, with a full and vigorous frame, thoroughly yet easily erect, with full high brow, finely chiselled features and lofty mien—with a soft, beaming blue eye, and a complexion fair and fresh, without being ruddy—exquisitely graceful in his carriage and quiet and easy in his movement, with his thin dark hair floating lightly around and from his head—his was a figure, as he passed along the crowded thoroughfare, upon which men turned to gaze, and the eyes of women rested with tenderness and veneration.

His presence, though graceful, was eminently dignified and commanding. It quietly expressed a very sensitive deference for the opinion and feelings of others—ready to hear and quick to appreciate—yet a full and steady reliance on himself. It is told of him that once at a country tavern, where he had stopped for the night, a poor inebriate was recklessly bantering the bystanders, when his attention was arrested by the appearance of the stately Bishop, and, awed and sobered for the moment by his commanding look and towering form, he turned to him and exclaimed, "And who are you? Are you a Judge? or a member of Congress? or Governor of the State? Well, if you aint any of these, you ought to be!" That which was felt by this poor fellow, has been felt by the highest and wisest and best in the land, in the same presence. Often have we watched that tall and graceful figure come swinging along the College grounds in company with grave professor or cheerful student, in serious talk or with his rich, soft, hearty laugh ringing out at some merry jest, and been conscious that a living grace was added to the picturesque scene within the bounds of the venerable school."—p. vii.

\* \* \* \* \*

"A young student, little more than a boy in years, but among the foremost in his class, was standing his first examination in mathematics before the assembled Faculty. He was nervous and excited, and, as he answered the questions which were propounded to him, he kept snapping and wasting the piece of chalk which he held in his hand, until there was but a scrap left, with which to write his figures and draw his diagrams. Professor Elliott was watching his examination with curious and pleased interest, when he saw the predicament in which he was placed. Rising quietly from his seat, he strolled down the room, picked up a handful of chalk which could neither be broken or wasted, and, with a droll and inimitable grace, handed it to the excited youth. A smile, a grateful look, a "thank you, sir," in reply, and the frightened probationer was at his ease before his examiners, and passed triumphantly through the ordeal, without any more faltering or scratching of his nails on the blackboard. It was but a little thing to do, but it was kindly and wisely done." \* \* \* \* \* p. viii.

In February, 1840, the Convention of South Carolina was called to elect a Bishop. Professor Elliott was the candidate

of nearly half the Clergy of the Diocese. It is said to have been an exciting contest, because of certain "revival" practices and tendencies that some strongly condemned while others allowed or approved. Dr. Gadsden was the successful candidate, a Clergyman of high position in South Carolina, more than twenty years the senior of Prof. Elliott, and nearly thirty years older in the ministry.

In May of the same year, he was elected first Bishop of Georgia: It was not, save in the sacred honor of the office, an attractive call. Nearly one-half the number of communicants, and more than half the strength of the Church, were in Savannah in one parish. The rest were scattered abroad, literally like sheep in a vast wilderness. Seven Clergy unanimously nominated him, and eight laity unanimously concurred. And yet this was "by far the fullest convention ever assembled since the organization of the Diocese." So says the "Report on the State of the Church." And this in a Diocese of 57,000 square miles, and over 650,000 inhabitants. A Missionary field as truly as is now Colorado and Nevada. "Nothing," writes the Bishop elect in his letter of resignation to the President of the College, "nothing but my duty to God, to whose service I have devoted myself, could have induced me to quit a station so agreeable to my literary tastes, and so important to the well-being of the College." The President, in communicating this resignation to the Board, says, "I think I do not express a sentiment which transcends the opinions of the Board, when I state my belief that no loss could well have been sustained by the Institution more to be deplored than this removal of one, who in every relation has contributed so largely to its honor and welfare."\* He was consecrated in Christ's Church, Savannah, in February, 1841, by the Bishop of Virginia, assisted by the Bishops of North and South Carolina.†

To secure a competent salary, it was necessary the Bishop should have a parochial charge. St. John's Church, Savannah,

---

\* La Borde's Hist. S. C. College.

† At this time Bishop Elliott had married his second wife, Miss Barnwell, of S. C., and cousin of the first Mrs. Elliott. There survive him his widow and all his children; two by the first and six by the second marriage.

was organized for him. In 1844, he removed to Montpelier to direct in person the work of female education. But neither of these extra Episcopal duties hindered him from the usual annual round of his Diocese. His journeys were, some years, 6,000 miles in extent, and in the days when railroads were just beginning to be known in Georgia. For a short time Florida also was provisionally under his jurisdiction.

His efforts in the cause of education cost him the loss of all things, as other Bishops of the Church have bitterly experienced in the same work. To human view, he failed; to human sagacity, he seemed perhaps unwise. There was on the institution a previous burden of debt. He was disposed to do everything thoroughly. He trusted, as a trustful nature is always ready to do. His was an uncalculating devotion, and, when embarked in the work, his was a chivalric sense of duty. And he was determined to save himself and the Institution, if not from ruin, yet from dishonor. Hence old unknown obligations, not incumbent on him to meet, were assumed. He lost all. His own inherited property and the fortune he acquired by marriage, all were swallowed up. Even to his library, a splendid collection of valuable and costly books, rare and precious volumes in literature, philology, law, theology, natural science, most of it once his father's, and hence the dearest of his patrimony,—to it, his sense of justice laid claim. Twenty years ago, it was sent to the block, sold and dispersed. This was a bitter trial. Out of it the Bishop came, ruined in fortune, but with integrity unimpeached. And it is not improper now to say, what few then knew, or perhaps even now know, that, when an offer was made to him by some wealthy friends to pay the debts remaining, debts contracted in the Church's work, he, with self-sacrificing heroism, resolved for a while to bear the burden and the blame, and peremptorily refused thus to be relieved.

And so he seemed to fail. The world so regards such things. As a Diocesan school, Montpelier did decline and die. It did bitterly disappoint the hopes of its founder. Yet these exhaustive efforts were not lost. All over Georgia, the seeds of future parishes were sown in these few years, in the affections of the pupils of Montpelier. Wherever one now is found, un-

der circumstances most unfavorable, there is found not only a devoted admirer of the Bishop, but a ready advocate of the Church: often waiting, almost without hope, for the Church to come and claim her own. She and her family have proved the nucleus around which gathers the rising parish. These sweet fruits of his early labors the Bishop did meet, and it was like a crown to his early hopes, that, two days before his sudden death, as the last official act of his life he laid the corner stone of a chapel at Montpelier, for which years ago himself gathered the material and drew the plan. The school is flourishing again, in other hands indeed, but doing the Church's work. It promises to accomplish, in the next quarter of a century, that which began twenty years ago to be achieved. So, usually, it is. Great projects for the good of man spring out of the full heart, and often drain the willing life. A coming generation reaps the harvest that blooms and bends above the early grave. But a glorious and beneficent thing had it been for the Church in Georgia, if the Diocese had never allowed Montpelier to decline. And a sweet satisfaction would it now be, to reflect that our lamented Bishop's heart had never groaned beneath this burden, and heaved with a sigh over the blasting of this early hope. Perhaps, too—God only knows—but, perhaps, that great heart had not so soon, so suddenly been broken. For well did the Bishop of Alabama, in his Memorial Sermon, say, after speaking of the frequent failures of fondly cherished schemes for the advancement of the Church, on the part of Bishops and Clergy, who have planned and then lamented them, "I assure you, brethren, it is these, and such like troubles, that break the spring, and prematurely snap the silver cord, of life."<sup>\*</sup>

---

<sup>\*</sup> In 1852, he became Rector of Christ's Church, Savannah, and so continued, with one brief interval, to his death.

In 1853, Rev. John Pierpont, a Unitarian preacher, challenged him, through the public prints, to a discussion. We have before us the Bishop's reply, suggesting a better mode to the lovers of truth. The history of this Unitarian movement in Savannah is suggestive. The effort resulted in nothing. Their beautiful little church edifice was sold, and is now the Church of St. Stephen's (colored) Parish.

In 1854, the yellow fever raged terribly in Savannah. The Bishop was constant in his self-perilling labors, night and day, in all parts of the city, and with all classes. In 1858, absent at the outbreak of the pestilence, he immediately re-

We have already given Bishop Elliott's views of the results of the "Revival System," commonly so called, and his appreciation, by contrast, of that of the Church. In 1846, there began and continued, for many weeks, a spiritual work among the pupils at Montpelier, of which he gives us the following account in his Convention Address of 1847.

"On the third Sunday of August, I admitted the Rev. Mr. Shanklin to the Holy Order of Priesthood, in the chapel attached to St. Luke's Church, Montpelier. This Ordination, and the preaching which followed it, were the commencement of one of the most interesting revivals of religion among the pupils of the Institute, which I have ever been called upon to witness. The Rector of the Parish—the Rev. Mr. Johnson—had been faithfully and quietly sowing the seeds of truth for a year in the hearts of these young people, and at last it pleased the Lord, under the ministrations of our newly ordained brother, to awaken many of them to a sense of their lost condition out of Christ. So soon as this outburst of feeling manifested itself, the Rev. Mr. Johnson and myself felt ourselves called upon, as the guardians of so many very young persons, to act with the utmost caution and prudence in the management of their spiritual experience. Although the feeling was deep and almost universal, we permitted no suspension of their duties or labors. We acted upon the principle, that, if the work was of the Holy Ghost, no performance of the duties of life would check its progress, and that what was to endure, if sound and true, through all the trials and temptations of life, had better be nurtured under the same severe discipline. And we found no cause to repent of our course; for, while we were gratefully conscious that there was no daily excitement goading the feelings of these children, and disabling them from discerning what spirit they were of, we were rejoiced to perceive that the work only spread and deepened, and assumed the shape of a daily searching of the Scriptures,

---

turned and stayed through. Such devotion made him a moral hero, in the eyes of the whole admiring and loving population.

The Bishop was a dear lover of nature; not alone in her beauties that please the eye, but in her mysteries that science must unfold. At Montpelier, horticulture in all its branches engaged his hours of relaxation. He had conservatories and gardens for flowers and fruit. An address of his, delivered in Macon, gave the results of those studies and was of great practical value. On his return to Savannah, he took up Conchology, and on his visitations through the Diocese, on the seaboard and in the mountains, in the little intervals of leisure, and even when in Cuba in 1857, for his health, he systematically pursued his researches in this science. Some Naiads, and Cyclostomæ, hitherto unknown to Naturalists, were discovered and reported by him. The "Academy of Natural Sciences," of Philadelphia, made him a member and named some of these new shells after him.



and of a deep self-examination into the motives of their actions, and into the hope which many of them expressed in Christ, their Saviour. After many weeks of probation—after a most careful and anxious examination of their grounds of faith, and after consultation with their parents, eighteen of these young persons were confirmed, and sixteen admitted to the Communion of the Church. These services were not performed until October and November; but I mention them here, in connection with the circumstances which led to the blessed result. Up to this time, we have no reason to believe that any one of these young persons was deceived in her repentance or faith. They are all steadfast, consistent young Christians, growing in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord."

A single sentence from another part of the same Address, tells us how he then regarded the so-called "revivals" of the age and country, and more than hints at the motives, in part, at least of those who directed them.

"But a few years since, and they (the Parishes of Macon and Columbus), were planted by a very feeble band of Christians, who determined to worship God in the way which they deemed Scriptural. Macon was the scene of the earliest attempt, but, after two or three years of labor, every thing was utterly prostrated under the effects of one of those whirlwinds of religious excitement, which are brought to bear so systematically upon our efforts."

It has been said that Bishop Elliott was a Calvinist. Probably, in his theoretical views of God's sovereign administration of His Kingdom of grace, he was something such a Calvinist as Bishop Beveridge. And if he was, he was also, especially in his riper years, as we will soon show, very much such a Churchman too. But, if he was a Calvinist, you would never learn it from his preaching. More, perhaps, than any preacher of such theological views, that we ever knew, did he illustrate Arch-Bishop Sumner's "Apostolical Preaching." Predestination, if ever he touched upon it, was not, in his discourse, heavy with eternal doom, but with present responsibility. Nor was election freighted with inevitable glory, but with precious privilege to the individual souls before him. Tender and gentle were the stately steppings of this "Messenger of the Covenant," when in God's House, and in his loving Master's name, he proclaimed the Gospel of Christ. It was from him "good news" to all anxious inquirers at the gate of Salvation, to all timid, doubting souls along the way of Life. He never broke

the bruised reed, nor quenched the smoking flax, nor held up high above reach, to feeble faith and just yearning penitence, the standard of God's acceptance. Multitudes love to recall the light and hope which, in the dark, desponding uncertainty of their first spiritual awakening, or in the "dimness of anguish," that, from another kind of preaching, had brooded over their hearts, came beaming in as he preached from such texts as these:—"I will arise and go to my Father," &c.

"What, according to the scheme of the Gospel, is the order of things? Must I approach God, or must I wait till He approaches me?"

"This is, you perceive, a practical question; and we must avoid all the metaphysics which may be made to play around it. Innumerable points connected with the Will might be discussed, which could only darken counsel by words without knowledge. But they are unnecessary here; for Christ, in His peculiar way, has passed them all by, and has made the Prodigal, out of the depths of his misery, say, 'I will arise and go to my Father.' No discussions about liberty or necessity—no cavillings about the motives which influence the Will—no question about power or impotence! The Gordian knot is cut at once by the common sense of a stern misery, and he determines to do that which he feels he can do—'Arise and go to his Father.' This is the answer to your question. The first move is required on *your* part, &c., &c."

"When you have made this resolution, you have included in the act the two conditions of salvation. You have repented and believed: repented, in that you are sorry that you have wandered away from God; believed, in that you have trusted the love of God in Christ, and have cast yourself upon His Mercy. And this view may relieve you of some of the difficulties, which are made to surround the doctrines of Repentance and Faith. They can be involved in much intricacy, and made to perplex an anxious soul; but here is our Lord's solution of them. With this Prodigal, repentance is made to be a turning away from a course of evil, and a turning unto God. No measures of repentance are described, no degree of sorrow or of tears fixed upon. It is simply a determination to change from the world to God. Sorrow for sin may accompany it, and certainly will be produced by it in the end; for the more we see of the holiness of God, the more shall we mourn over our own corruption. But it may not be very intense in the beginning of the Christian Life. Our whole change is produced by the Spirit of God, and the degree of our compunction will be regulated by Him. He may choose to work no further in you at first than to lead you to determine to arise and go to your Father. This is for Him to decide, and not for you; and, if you have made up your mind sincerely to go to God, that is enough.

Leave the Divine Spirit to deal with you as He thinks best, touching the degree of sorrow you may feel; and, as with repentance, so with faith. It is made, in the analogy of this parable, to consist in casting one's self upon the love and mercy of God. It is independent of all frames and feelings, and is simply *trust in God*; such a belief in His abounding compassion, in and through Christ, as shall lead you to go to Him, exactly as you are, trusting that He will make all the necessary changes within you."

"Your next step is confession—confession to God, and not to man. 'Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before Thee, and am no more worthy to be called Thy son;' that is, 'I have sinned against Thee, my Father in Heaven.' When you will do this, my hearer, you are fast making your peace with God; because you have at last recognized the real evil of sin to be its offense against God.

\* \* \* When a confession, therefore, such as this, falls from the lips of man, it is a sure sign of grace—a token that he has been moved by the Holy Ghost to arise and go to His Father." \* \* \* \*

"The last grace which is developed in these verses, is that sweet grace of humility. 'Make me as one of Thy *hired* servants' \* \* I am not worthy to be Thy son. Put me in the very lowest place, as one of Thy *hired* servants.' \* \* I do not ask even for the place of a slave, born in Thy house, or bought with Thy money; because they can claim Thine attachment, and Thou art bound to them by ties of interest, and obligation, and feeling. But make me as one of Thy *hired* servants, between whom and Thee there is no necessary tie; from whom Thou mayest separate Thyself at any moment, without a pang. Even this place I will be satisfied with, if so be Thou wilt admit me to Thine house."—*Sermon xxxviii.*

The exposition contained in this last paragraph is suggestive also of another topic.

And, in the next place, let us see how beautifully, in his Sermon on "*Quench not the Spirit*," he brings the young into the bonds of the Covenant, and gently leads them along the green pastures, and by the still waters, of the Church's providing:—

"One would suppose, that the very last person in the world to 'quench the Spirit' in a child, would be a Christian Parent—one, who had tasted the preciousness of Christ, the joy and peace in believing. And yet, unnatural and monstrous as it may seem, parents are often the very first. \* \* They bring it to the Baptismal Font; they pray that the Holy Spirit may be poured out upon it; that it may be regenerate and born again of water and of the Spirit; that it may be made an heir of Everlasting Salvation; they hear the Minister declare, that the "child is regenerate and grafted in the Body of Christ's Church," and they go away, proving by their conduct, that they have no faith in the ordinance, or in the promises of God; because they forthwith conclude, that the child cannot be, and must not be religious,

until it shall have reached a certain undefined period of life, and have passed through a certain routine of worldly experience. How much early piety is thus extinguished! \* \* \* How many heavenward aspirations are quenched in those, of whom Christ said, 'of such is the kingdom of Heaven.' \* \* \* The Spirit of God deals with our children, my beloved people, at a very early age; nay, we have reason to hope, from the very moment when we dedicate them to God in Baptism. Let it be our duty to guard and direct that influence, treating it as we should a tender and delicate plant, which is just pushing its feeble blade through the earth, which nourishes and yet buries it." \* \* \*

"As the children of the Church advance in age, they pass, from the parents' teaching, under that of the ministering servants of the Lord. And they, too, must be very careful not to quench the Holy Spirit in the young. They, too, may fall into a like error, with that noticed in parents,—of not expecting the young to devote themselves to Christ; of fearing to encourage their profession, lest they may prove unsteady, inconsistent, or may fall away from their profession. My own experience has rid me very much of this fear. It has been my lot, as a minister, to be thrown very much with the young, and over the young; and, in almost every instance of early profession, I have found a very great consistency of Christian character, a very great steadfastness in the love of the Church. And I say this for the encouragement of any young persons, who may now be desirous of Confirmation in the Church of Christ, and may yet be hesitating, and fearing to profess Christ before the world. 'Quench not the Spirit.' He is striving with you now,—calling you, at a most impressive period of your life, when you have virgin hearts to offer to the Lord. Listen to the call. Be obedient to His voice of love. Follow His holy and divine guidance. Meet Him—where He loves to dwell—in the Church, and at the Altar; and you will lay up for yourselves a rich fountain of happiness for your future life."—*Sermon xxi.*

And oh! how sweetly, in his personal contact with his people in his own Parish, or in the Parishes of his Diocese, in all which there was, in many hearts, the same pastoral tie towards him, as towards the Chief Shepherd and Bishop of souls, how sweetly and gently he opened and cleared the way to the full treasures of the Church's Fold! And with what glad surprise, in days gone by, have some of his Clergy, who had labored in the straight plain path of taking the Catechism and Baptismal and Confirmation services as meaning what they say, and presented large classes of the young to be confirmed by him, received his warmest approval on the mode and result of their labors! "Only see the difference," he once exclaimed to us, referring to the fruitless results of the labors of other minis-

ters, equally devoted and capable ; "simply because they will put every body through the same course of experience, and expect results before they have well used the means of grace."

We make two quotations more, from an unpublished Sermon, on the text, "*I see men as trees walking.*" Gratefully do we recall the blessed effect, the utterance of the sentiments of which the first is a sample, and then the overwhelming indignation, with which, in the second, he reprobated the conduct of some Christian pastors entrusted with the cure of souls :—

"The second cause of confusion is when sanctification is confounded with justification, and we are expected to bring forth and exhibit all the fruits of the Spirit, at the moment when we first turn to Jesus as our Saviour. And it is just this point, which has brought about the state of things which we find pressing upon so many inquiring minds. They are distressed, because, after some effort in the religious life, they are not enjoying feelings which really belong only to the matured and experienced Christian. \* \* \* Instead of coming into the Christian Church to ripen, and to feed upon the nourishment which Christ has placed there for the growth of His faithful, those who are stretching forth their hands, if haply they may find Christ and lean upon Him, are taught to keep aloof. \* \* \* The fruits of the Spirit are called for, when the seed is really just being sown ; the experience of a man is demanded from a babe, just opening its eyes on the spiritual world." \* \* \*

"Who would be bold enough to quench the smoking flax ? Not I ; for I might crush, by my harshness, this infant life, which I am appointed to cherish. \* \* \* The point to be determined is, not how much life it has, but whether it has any life at all. \* \* \* When this can be determined, there can be no hesitation. It is the duty of every minister, and every Christian, to speed on the good work, and not to criticise it, and measure it, and weigh it, and exact promises from it. As well might a conclave of nurses surround a new born child, and refuse to let it live, because it was not as large as some other child, or as beautiful, or as lively, or because it did not promise, while it was yet struggling for life in its new world, never to be sick as long as it lived."

The quotations already made, evince how highly our Bishop appreciated, and how truly he loved the Order and the Teaching of the Church. We advance to the further point,—his view of the Church as a visible, Divine Institution, with an appointed Ministry. In the printed volume of his sermons, we refer to Sermon xxxiv, *The tests of Truth and Error*. 1st Jno., iv., 5, 6. He enumerates but two. And what are these? We

give them in his own words. He had previously said :—"All along the history of the Church are spread out the various heresies, which have disfigured and perverted the truth," and he sums up his first test, and states his second, in the following maxims :—

"When a spirit is not accepted by the children of God, beware of it! When it does not harmonize with the doctrinal teachings of the Church, turn away from it! It is false, and will run rapidly into error. This is one test. But there is yet another, quite as important, which must be kept before the mind; and that is, that any doctrine is necessarily error, which strikes at the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, or elevates anything above Him in reverence and in worship."

Christ and His Church! The one The Truth, the other the Pillar and Ground of the Truth revealed! Such is his coupling of the only tests here mentioned. Again, in that beautiful discourse on "Subordination and Uniformity," Sermon xlii, "*See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount* :—

"That arrangement," he asserts, "which separates the Ministry into a three-fold Order, Deacons, Priests, and Bishops, was begun by Christ Himself, and was perfected by His Apostles, acting under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. As there was no parity in earth or Heaven, so did Christ permit no parity in His Church."

And, again, in his Sermon at the Consecration of St. John's Church, Savannah, May 7, 1853, from the text, "*Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world*," hear him enumerate the three great notes of "evidence, that we are of that Church with which Christ promised to be, to the end of the world."—"Soundness in the Faith"—(the Bible on the Lecturn and the Prayer Book on the Lord's Table)—the "*Due administration of the Sacraments*,"—"the "*Ministerial Succession*." His elaboration of this third note is published in the volume of Sermons. Those who doubt, may there find, to their surprise, how bold and uncompromising are his assertion and defence, and know how low a Churchman Bishop Elliott was. There was nothing low in the view and value of anything revealed, in the mind and heart of such a man. But there were



breadth of view, and largeness of comprehension. The pine is lofty, when but a hundredth part so high as the mountain, and strikes the eye less by its altitude than by its breadth and proportion. Bishop Elliott held all truth dear. Perhaps some would have had in greater prominence his "Church Principles," distinctively so called. But we know he held them, and, when his mind did seize upon and present them, it was with a unity peculiar to himself, and with a consequent clearness and vigor, that surprised his delighted hearers. "Why does not the Bishop preach that, oftener?" some have asked. Doubtless it was his estimate of the due proportion of Faith, that decided his course. He did dwell, more and more frequently, as his life advanced, on these distinctive features of the Church; doubtless, too, because of his growing appreciation of their importance to the preservation and perpetuation of the intrinsically precious Truth. We take up his own words, over the bier of that champion of the Apostleship in the Episcopate, his brother of Alabama, and, in them, assert of him, "He knew no other Master than Jesus Christ and Him crucified; and, next to Christ, Who is the Head, he loved the Church, which is His Body, with his whole heart."

As to the relation of the Church to surrounding denominations, he did prefer the theoretical distinction of Archbishop Bramhall, and some of the divines of the 16th century, of *Churches, perfect or imperfect*," to the one now prevalent, *Church or no Church*. But he was the last to compromise the Church by sinking her claims, while yet, such was his loving, courteous nature, he did gain the affection of all who knew him. His regard to the rubrics, this fact will illustrate. Other Bishops, and especially one, now gone to an honored grave, noted as a stickler for the strict interpretation of the rubrics, once scouted the idea advanced by our Bishop, that it was his duty, in the service of the Ordinal, himself to go through with the whole wearying succession of Litany, Examination and Ordination of the Candidates, Ante-Communion administration, and Post-Communion, simply because the rubric so directs. And, time after time, have we known him, in this warm climate, with ample clerical force at hand, perform it all, to his



own exhaustion, simply because the rubric gave him no option. Yet, in his Convention Address, in 1855, while discussing the "Memorial" movement, after asserting that the Church's "power is . . . in her Scriptural Orders, her settled Faith, her unchanging ritual," he does advocate a wise discretion in adapting, without violation of the rubrics, the different distinct Sunday Services to the circumstances of the case.

Bishop Elliott used to preach, when not in the robes of his office, in the black gown, that badge of Puritanism, as some regard it, that "gloomy symbol of sin and death," as one preacher has lately called it. But let us note his defence of the practice. When he went into the pulpit to speak as a teacher, in his prophetic office, he put off the robes in which he offered, for the people, their sacrifice of prayer and praise, or distributed the consecrated emblems of the great Sacrifice. "I, by so doing,"—his own words,—"*exalt my Priestly Office*, by laying aside the peculiar dress of the Priest." Think as we may of the weight of the reason, again we see a proof of Churchly views entertained by him concerning the sacred ministry.

One element of sound Churchmanship is conspicuous in our lamented Bishop, i. e., fidelity to the standards of the English Church. In his first Convention Address, 1841, he says :—

"In adhering to her (the Anglican Church) embodied doctrine, and her wonted practice, we cast no contempt upon ancient Christianity, but only say, we prefer her judgment, as a Church, in regard to it, over that of any that may be offered to our acceptance, from whatever quarter. *Catholic antiquity is no longer an open question in the Church.*"

Twelve years later, commenting on the fall of the Bishop of North Carolina, he says :—

"Any man is in danger, who becomes discontented with the Scriptural principles on which our Reformation was planted, and sighs after practices and usages, of which he thinks Protestantism has unjustly deprived him."

He then re-iterates the assertions of his Primary Address, and still further insists upon them, and concludes in these pregnant words :—

"Here lies the fallacy of the whole matter, in assuming that our formularies are of modern date,—the spawn of Protestantism,—instead of knowing and feeling, that they concentrate the essence of Catholic Antiquity, as extracted by men, before whose Patristic learning the best of our modern scholars might well hang their heads."

We may easily conclude where, on questions now beginning to agitate the American Church, Bishop Elliott stood. Something in the Ritualistic movement would, perhaps, commend itself to his love of the comely and appropriate, as worthy of God's worship, and useful to the worshipper,—if not contrary to the allowance of the Church, or pushed onward, as it often is, in contempt of the counsel, and in defiance of the authority, of those over us in the Lord. Much of it would fall, for this reason, under his unsparing condemnation. And yet, while declaring himself opposed to "Ritualism," then so termed, he declined to unite with the twenty-eight Bishops in their "Declaration." The reasons are before us, in his own hand. They are the marks of that beautiful harmony of his character, the union of strength and gentleness, intense devotion to principles, and yet delicate regard to the sensibilities, and especially the rights of those who might not agree with him. The substance of his reasons was, that it was an extra-official act, and hence unwise as a precedent, and injudicious toward the evil itself.

In the matter of Episcopal authority, he held high views, although almost never, in his jurisdiction, was that authority felt. That generally professed, but so conveniently forgotten, principle, of obedience to the Bishop, is the distinctive feature in our Church Polity. But when this authority, in exercise, crosses self-will, or thwarts individual judgment, on matters great or small, to the winds go principle and practice. No father of a Christian family feels his advice so contemned, his judgment so opposed, his authority so persistently denied, his errors so ruthlessly paraded, as the 'Father in God.' Of what use is our Episcopal theory, if the Episcopate be not, in itself, respected and obeyed? Such were his views, concerning the Bishop's right to rule, though seldom was he made to feel the want of submission, in his own Diocese. It was not often that

he exercised his authority, and then, with such a reasonableness, and in such a loving way, that obedience was the submission of both mind and heart, and far outran compulsion. But in the disturbances of the Christian family, in England and America, he felt, that so much loss accrued to the Church's peace and power, from the glaring inconsistency between the profession and the practice of the sons of the Church in this matter of "Canonical obedience." And this, too, in his impartial view, without reference to the Bishop's peculiar theological tenets. It was as apparent in Massachusetts, as, in days gone by, in New Jersey. A profound modern thinker has shown, that, when earnest men take opposing views of the same great truth, the truth lies not so much in a golden mean as in a grander truth than either have as yet beheld, which embraces both. Some few men so comprehend it now. While they live, noisy partisans misunderstand them. When gone, their contemplated, completed life, towers above these lesser divinities, toward that clear light and that lofty height, where truth's harmonies are all outspread before Him, Who is their source. Blessed be God for the faith in each other's soundness, the patience with each other's minds, the charity towards each other's hearts, which the example of our first 'Father in God' has taught his revering children.

In the breadth and equipoise of his character, were united traits that balanced each other:—dignity and affability,—strength and gentleness,—acknowledged superiority and unvarying courtesy. And beneath the calm, self-assured equanimity, there was in repose a vehement indignation, rarely aroused, and a resistless energy, unsuspected till the occasion called it out. One who heard him at the General Convention, in 1859, in Richmond, wrote to a friend in Georgia, "I heard your Bishop yesterday, and he does preach like a lion." A forcible, and often a beautiful, description of one who, usually, like his Master, gentle as a lamb, yet, in his intenser moods, might remind us of the words of prophecy, first applied to that Master Himself, "Who shall rouse Him up?" In the photographic likeness prefixed to his printed Sermons, we see the kindling of the holy fire. It is not the expression usual to him, nor that his friends love best. But perhaps it does most

befit the unblenching spirit that there looks out, which, through reproach and opposition, through suffering and through toil, "*in utroque paratus*," secured the steady consistency of his finished course.

One of those occasions, that try the material of which men are made, occurred in the House of Bishops, in 1844. A memorial, preferring charges against the Bishop of New York, was introduced, signed by gentlemen of unquestioned truth, personally known to Bishop Elliott. Men will even wonder, that any Bishops opposed investigation, and that some, who knew Bishop Onderdonk best, refused to examine the affidavits. The purity of their lawn was aspersed. By refusing investigation, the stain of one was the disgrace of all. So felt the venerable Otey. "Duty to Bishop Onderdonk," says he, "as well as duty to the Church, required me no longer to hesitate." And when other and older Bishops did hesitate and refuse, our Bishop, one of the four youngest in office, and the very youngest in years, arose and said, that he knew the gentlemen whose names were appended to the memorial; and that, if others would not, he must consent to investigate. He scarcely knew Bishop Onderdonk. What he had seen, had favorably impressed him. But duty compelled him. Such was his own brief statement of the case.

For a long time it was customary to call this prosecution a party prosecution. The name of Bishop Otey should ever have stifled that suspicion, and what has been said of Bishop Elliott, should make its revival impossible. Among the determined opponents to any action, one, whose recent grave his deserted Church cannot greatly honor, furiously declared, that the man, who should touch the case, would be ground out beneath the heel of the Church.

Very pleasant, now that the violence of those days has passed, is it to reflect, that the Church's calm voice has approved the course then pursued. And pleasant also is it to note, how they, who thus stood up in bold vindication of the purity of their Order, afterwards drew closer to each other in their views of the relative importance of the polity and life of the Church. How Bishop Otey, bred in the school of Ravenscroft, to deem

Apostolical Order indispensable to the transmission of Evangelical Truth,—and Bishop Elliott, accustomed more to delight himself in the clear possession of the truth, than contend about the mode of its preservation,—how these two children of the light drew, as they neared their now entered rest, more and more together, till, even this side the veil, in almost everything, they saw “eye to eye.”

It is unnecessary to dwell upon the scheme, ten years ago so grandly conceived, in which Bishop Elliott's head and hand and heart were engaged. Visionary, many deemed the ideal University of the South. But he, and they who acted with him, and they who understood them, believed more and more firmly, that it was a coming reality. Never were auspices of a great enterprise more favorable. The required endowment had been secured from a mere fraction of the ten Dioceses. The pledged wealth was still increasing, and would have been poured in. Only, the storm that spread ruin over the land has shorn the beautiful vision of its former magnificent proportions.

During the war, Bishop Elliott preached and published a Sermon on Samson's Riddle. “*Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness.*” In it, out of all-devouring war, some morsels of sweetness were extracted. We have since heard him assert, that one glorious truth, one grand lesson for the nation and the world, was offered us, worth all the pangs and losses of the bitter struggle. And that was, “*the Unity*, again so conspicuously displayed, *the Unity of the Church.*” She had stood the test. A few weeks previous to the cessation of hostilities, he found, amid the ruins of St. Philip's Church property, in Atlanta, a bit of printed paper. Not long after the war had closed, he thus narrates the incident. “I picked it up, and my eye fell directly upon these words. ‘The office of a Bishop has descended from generation to generation, from the Apostles' times.’ It went directly to my heart, as a ray of unspeakable comfort; it was a voice from the midst of earthly ruin, saying unto me, and, through me, to the Church, ‘Be not dismayed; the Church shall arise from Her ashes, and put on the beautiful garments of Her Holiness, and no matter what man may do unto Her, She

shall be indestructible in Her ministry of truth.'” While the war was raging, in that unsurpassed Pastoral he sent forth his greeting in the Lord. We are willing to put this only Pastoral of the House of Bishops in the Confederacy, side by side with its contemporary of Philadelphia. Its whole burden was, “charity, the very bond of peace.” It was entirely from his pen, on a single evening. And, when the time came again that tried, not only the material of which men were made, but the added graces that through Christ and the Holy Ghost are acquired, the graces of patience and trust toward God, and forgiveness and love towards men, he, the representative man of the Church South, rose sublimely above the ruin of his earthly hopes. All his ideas of Constitutional liberty had been trodden under. All his rapt predictions, that, as from the lips of inspiration, had rolled over the land, and only needed success to stamp them prophetic, had died out in present failure. All his expectations for the servile race, for whose welfare he plead and prayed, and whose very existence he felt, as a people, was at stake, had come to naught.\* He stood, again, by the grave of his brother Bishop, slain in battle, and owned all he then or elsewhere had ever said or done. “Before all Israel and before the sun,” he would have the record placed. Only “silence” for the past was demanded, and he cast all behind his back. The Church respected the grandeur of his grief. In the silence of the calm that followed, the parted family of God has re-united itself on earth. To that union we feel that no one contributed more than our lamented Bishop. The bold,

---

\*In this great peace-offering we make to the permanent literature of the whole Church, we purposely avoid more than a passing allusion to views political and social, that formed a portion of the very being of such men as Bishop Elliott. In his Convention Address of 1861, his convictions as to when and how political events affected the states of a Bishop and a Diocese, are clearly and succinctly given. In his ‘Address,’ in 1866, his vindication of the peculiar institution, and of the Southern Church, is long, full, loving, and clear. It has not been answered. As to the future of the emancipated race, he was full of sad forebodings. Many of us think we can trace the progress of an inevitable fulfillment of his misgivings. It may suggest a line of thought to some minds, to record an oft expressed sentiment of Bishop Elliott, on his return from Cuba. We give it as we heard it from his own lips. “If slavery here was what it is in Cuba, I would be an abolitionist to-morrow.”

open stand he took, owning all, and asking man's pardon for none, helped to lay deep and broad, in the open view of God and man, the foundations of a true, because an honorable, and hence a lasting peace. Certainly, no one more rejoiced over this blessed result, or has better described it :—

“Men listened to hear how the Church would speak and act in her great Council, called up from all parts of the lately convulsed and agitated country. And grandly and sublimely did she bear herself in the sight of the world. Instead of anathemas, there were warm greetings of renewed friendship, and tears of reconciled love; instead of excommunications, there was hearty welcome, and assurances of rejoicing hearts over the healing of the wounds which had been produced by political strife. Everything was done that a divine charity could dictate, and the action of the Convention satisfied every one, that there was no longer any ground for a continued separation.”—*Convention Address, 1866.*

It was his last address to his gathered Diocese. It was his legacy of peace to us, and the whole Church. In the midst of his active administration, never more hopeful of the Church's rising life and rapid growth, in the vigor of his age and the height of his power, he died as he had wished, “suddenly,” not unprepared. On the Feast of the Nativity of the Prince of Peace he was laid to his repose, while the Angels' song was sounding through our united Church, and round our warring world. He was the thirteenth Bishop who, since peace had begun to be disturbed, had entered into rest;—six on this side the battle's edge, and six on that, and one who, born on this side, and sustained by that, and loved in both, now sleeps in the far off eastern grave.

“So draw we nearer day by day  
Each to the other, all to God.”

Again that salutation of Heaven to earth is sounding, “Peace to men of good will.” Towards all parts of our country, and towards every quarter of our ransomed world, over the graves of our honored Fathers in God, we send forth our greeting of peace and good will. Every “son of peace” in our united family will take up the strain, and, over their finished lives, exclaim in thankful adoration, “Glory to God on high, on earth peace, good will towards men.”

CHRISTMAS, 1867.



## ART IV.—SKETCHES OF ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

## BISHOPS OF LLANDAFF.

GRINDAL alone, amongst all the English Prelates, maintained his place by repeated submission. Elevated under the doubtful policy of the latter years of King Henry, he acquiesced, with but a feeble opposition, in the entire reformation under Edward the Sixth. Like several of his brethren, he reverted, not unwillingly, under Queen Mary, to the doctrines and habits of former years ; and even passed sentence, though with evident reluctance, and after earnest persuasions to reflection and recantation, on one of the martyrs, a poor fisherman of Cardiff. This good man, whose name was Rawlins White, had what the Bishop had not, a faith that could suffer the loss of all things ; for he died at the stake, while Kitchin alone, of all the Bishops whom the accession of Queen Elizabeth found in office, conformed, and was unmolested. He was then more than fourscore, and never afterwards appeared in Parliament ; but died on the vigil of All Saints, 1563, and was buried at Matherne, near Chepstow, where the Bishops of Llandaff had a residence.

At the same spot, after eleven years and fifteen days, the next Bishop, Hugh Jones, found a grave. The See had remained vacant three years ; and Grindal had hoped in vain that the venerable Coverdale might there conclude his days ; but Coverdale died in his willing retirement. Bishop Jones, who was of New Inn Hall, Oxford, had been a parish Clergyman in Wales, and afterwards Vicar of Banwell, on the opposite shore of Somerset. It is remarkable, that he was the first Welshman who had presided over this Welsh Diocese, since the conquest of the land by Edward the First. He died at the age of sixty-six ; and, of a Bishop of these days, so little known, it is something to be assured that he had not adhered to that clerical celibacy which in his youth was a law, and which, till his death, Queen Elizabeth would have made a custom.

At Matherne, also, reposes the next Prelate, William Blethyn, who was also a Welshman, and of the same College, and was also a husband and a father. His Consecration, in 1575, was the last performed by Archbishop Parker, and his death occurred in October, 1590, after an Episcopate of which our ignorance permits us to hope all things, except eminence.

An eminent name is that of Gervase Babington, who, in August, 1591, was consecrated by Whitgift, his old Master at Trinity College, Cambridge. His family was of Nottinghamshire, and not without note ; but he became Chaplain to the Earl of Pembroke ; and this connection brought him to the West. The admirable Countess, whom Jonson celebrates,

"Sidney's sister, Pembroke's mother,"

versified many of the Psalms, and received assistance from the Chaplain, himself the author of a Conference between Man's Frailty and Faith, and of a Comment on the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. Lord Pembroke had estates and influence in South Wales ; and Babington, after being made a Prebendary of Hereford, and Treasurer of Llandaff, succeeded to the now impoverished Bishopric, from the name of which he would sometimes, in good humor, drop the first syllable, saying that the "land" was alienated. A most impressive and useful preacher, he had the power of elevating at once the affections of his hearers, and holding them up till the end of his sermon. At the age of forty he was consecrated. At forty-five he was translated to Exeter ; and it was in the intermediate time, that he published his Comment on the Pentateuch, uniting to a pious life the laborious industry of a learned Theologian.

It was not till 1588, that the entire Bible was given to the Welsh in their own language. The New Testament had been published twenty-one years before ; the Old was now translated, and the New revised, by William Morgan, of St. John's College, Cambridge, Vicar of Welshpool, in the Diocese of St. Asaph. This most evangelical service done to his native land, and well remembered there, led to his elevation, in 1595, to the See of Llandaff, from which he was translated, in 1601, to that in which he had been a pastor.

His successor, Francis Godwin, was the first son of a Bishop, for many ages, who had himself attained the Episcopal Office; if we except, in corrupt times, some supposed instances of illegitimacy. He was the son of Thomas Godwin, the good Bishop of Bath and Wells; and he had married the daughter of another Prelate, who had been much revered for his pious earnestness, Bishop Woolton, of Exeter. Born in Northamptonshire, he pursued his studies at Christ Church, Oxford, and became an ingenious philosopher, an accomplished scholar, and a distinguished inquirer into antiquities. At that time he wrote a curious work, called "*The Man in the Moon, or a Discourse of a Voyage thither,*" which was never published during his lifetime, but in which his conjectures anticipated some of the most signal discoveries of science. He also invented a correspondence by signals, which he suppressed; till, many years after his elevation to the Episcopate, it came to the quick ears of King James the First, as if it had been some dangerous secret. His pursuits and talents made him the friend of the learned Camden, and the accomplished Lord Buckhurst, whose Chaplain he became; and the station of his father secured to him the Rectorship of Sandford-Orcas, and the Vicarages successively of Weston-Zoyland and Bishop's Lydiard, in Somersetshire, with a Prebend in the Cathedral of Wells. In 1590 he travelled into Wales, with Camden; and, doubtless not without assistance from that Master in history, he had just published his Catalogue of English Bishops, when he was added to the catalogue. It has been thought that in that book he displayed some puritanical prejudice against the Prelates, before the Reformation; but the memory of their times was then recent, and was not yet tinged with a romantic hue. Along with his See, he was permitted, on account of his small revenues, to hold the benefice of Kingston-Seamoor, on the Somersetshire shore. His habits were studious, and his acquaintance with the affairs of the world is said to have been limited. In the early years of his Episcopate, the alarm of the Gunpowder Plot, and other rumors, provoked a rigid enforcement of the laws against Popish recusants. A Curate, somewhere on the border of South Wales, refused to bury a woman of that class: her

friends were enraged ; the country people, among whom it is rather surprising to find at that period any favor towards Rome, arose in tumult ; and Godwin, with his neighbor, Bishop Bennet of Hereford, was compelled to flee for his own safety. In 1616, Bishop Godwin published, in Latin, *Annals of the Reigns of Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth and Mary*, and a Latin edition of his *Catalogue* ; and, in the following year, on the death of Bennet, he was transferred to the adjoining Diocese.

Another writer of history, and friend of Camden, succeeded at Llandaff : this was the excellent Bishop George Carleton. His father, Guy Carleton, was Keeper of the Fortress, since sung as "Norham's castled steep," upon the Tweed ; and he was trained under that Apostle of the North, Bernard Gilpin, whose life he wrote with affectionate reverence. More than forty years he had spent at Oxford ; first, as a scholar of St. Edmund's Hall ; then, as Fellow, and at length, as Warden, of Merton College ; and he was now fifty-seven years old, and carried along with him, not only his learning in Divinity, but, what Camden praised, his love for eloquence and poetry. His *Heroic Characters* were inscribed to Sir Henry Neville, whose widow, the daughter of Sir Henry Killigrew, he afterwards married. It was either not long before or not long after this marriage, that he passed from his College to the Episcopate ; and, having been consecrated in July, 1618, was placed, in the following autumn, at the head of the deputation sent by King James to the Synod of Dort. As one of the elder school of Theologians, he concurred in the Calvinistic decisions of that Assembly, but offered, in the name of the English Church, a protest against the parity of ministers. The Dutch States, in their letter to the King, extolled Carleton as the "image and express likeness of virtue ;" for they had been impressed with his grave dignity ; and, soon after his return, the royal approbation was declared, by his removal to the See of Chichester.

Theophilus Field was the son of a distinguished preacher, the Vicar of St. Giles, Cripplegate, and was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge. Like Bishop Babington, he was pat-

ronized by an Earl of Pembroke ; but, unhappily, he also supposed that he had influence with the then all-powerful Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, or with that great man who then presided over the highest court in England, Lord Bacon. A gentleman named Egerton had a suit in Chancery, and Field and two others undertook to procure a stay of the decree against him, and a new hearing, and received from him, in return, a recognizance for the payment of six thousand pounds, to be divided between themselves and "some honorable persons." Buckingham would not interfere ; and two or three years after, when Field had become Bishop of Llandaff, the whole transaction was exposed, among the charges again the great Chancellor, "the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind." The Bishop pleaded in the House of Lords, where the matter was laid open, that he had yielded only to the solicitations and tears of a friend to whom he owed his very life; protested that, of the principal sum, he was to have received nothing ; but admitted that, if he had an eye to some private advantage to his wife and children, he had sinned against God in not relying entirely on Him for their maintenance. After this weak apology, the Lords voted that he should receive an admonition from the Primate, in the Convocation-House ; but permitted him, though by no means with unanimity, to retain his seat before the admonition. An incident is also told, which indicates that he was far from meeting the Apostolic requisition, that "a Bishop must be blameless." He once invited Bishop Davenant to dine ; who, not much pleased with some of the company, retired soon after dinner. As his host offered to light him down the stairs, Davenant, a man of strict holiness of life, said, with a significance which was felt, "My Lord, my Lord, let us lighten others by an unblamable conversation." Bishop Field, however, published in 1624, "A Christian Preparation to the Lord's Supper ;" and, in 1627, he was appointed to succeed Laud in the adjoining Diocese of St. David's.

The See of Llandaff, now impoverished and obscure, was long supplied with a succession of Prelates, whose private worth and pastoral faithfulness may have been known and written on high, but who left few memorials beyond their own

generation. Such was William Murray, who was translated from the Irish See of Kilfenora, in 1627, and died in 1638, without further removal. The Diocese could not have much shared in that ardor of religious discussion which was so widely spread throughout England ; for he reported, in 1633, in reply to the inquiries of Archbishop Laud, that there was not in it a single schismatical minister, or stubborn non-Conformist, and but one lecturer. Something might be due to the retired and rural position of the people ; something, possibly, to the discretion and mildness of the Diocesan.

On his death, Morgan Owen, the son of a Clergyman of Caermarthenshire, and himself at one time Master of the Free School at Caermarthen, was elevated to his place ; probably through the influence of Laud, who had noticed him as "a useful man, and zealous of the Church," and had procured for him his Doctorate. He was of Hart Hall and Jesus College, Oxford ; and it was one of the articles in the impeachment of the Primate, that Bishop Owen, with his connivance, had enclosed the South yard of the Church of St. Mary at Oxford, and built a porch, amongst the carvings of which was an image of the Virgin with a babe in her arms. This was at his own charge, for he was somewhat wealthy. Complaints against him, as well as several other Bishops, went up, in 1641, to the Long Parliament ; and he was one of those who, having signed the protest against the proceedings of Parliament in their absence, were sent to the Tower. When he was brought to the bar for this, and charged with treason, he said that he had signed through ignorance and indiscretion. He paid a thousand pounds, as composition, and died about three years after, having endowed his old School at Caermarthen with thirty pounds a year. At his death, he was on the verge of sixty ; and he left the nation in arms, and the Church dismantled and tottering.

The ecclesiastical edifices, also, could not but hasten to decay, during the sixteen years of confusion which ensued. We can imagine how desolate must have been, beyond others, the lonely village Cathedral at Llandaff, where no popular preacher could gather a multitude, and the familiar, majestic sounds of

the Liturgical services were silent. During that period, the piety and moderation of the Archdeacon of St. David's, Hugh Lloyd, had found some favor, even from the opponents of his Order. He had begun life as a servitor of Oriel College, Oxford; had then become a Fellow of Jesus College, the College of the Welsh; for he was from Cardiganshire, and had afterwards been Rector of two parishes in Glamorganshire. Deprived of his place, the father of a numerous family, he was reduced to close expedients for their subsistence, and published at this time a Latin schoolbook. But, in his later elevation, he was often heard to say, that he had lived then not less to his satisfaction than as Bishop of Llandaff. To that See he was consecrated in November, 1660, six months after the Restoration; and there, for seven years, in primitive piety, and with paternal moderation, he presided, among his countrymen. In 1662, he published a Letter to the Clergy of his Diocese, at a time when the Act of Uniformity was the cause of much dissension and distress; but he was not inclined to rigid measures, nor to retaliation. At the advanced age of seventy-three, he assumed his Episcopal charge; and in the summer of 1667, at fourscore, was laid with his predecessors, probably at Matherne.

The Archdeacon, Francis Davies, who was born and had been beneficed within the Diocese, and had also been a Fellow of Jesus College, now succeeded, and, like Bishop Lloyd, survived seven years. Under the Commonwealth, he had kept a school, and afterwards, going up to London, had been Chaplain to that good Countess of Peterborough, who sheltered the old age of the saintly Archbishop Usher. He was the author of a Catechism explanatory of the Lord's Prayer and the Creed; and it was by such works, that the principles of the doctrine of Christ were deeply fixed in the minds of the rural population. His grave is at Llandaff Cathedral. He was one among the many Bishops of the times of the Stuart sovereigns, who died unmarried.

The Welsh surnames are little distinctive; and thus it happened, not only that another Bishop Lloyd succeeded; but that, while he was upon the bench, three other Bishops of the



same surname, and one, who besides had the same Christian name, received Consecration ; and that a Bishop Lloyd within that time presided over each of the four Welch Dioceses ; this William Lloyd at Llandaff, another William at St. Asaph, Humphrey at Bangor and John at St. David's. Of these, the first had been a curate at Deptford ; and, being an active and laborious man, was, in 1678, transferred from Llandaff to Peterborough.

Through the next twenty-seven years, while Charles the Second dishonored his crown and people by his profligacy ; while his brother assailed the Liberties and the Religion of England through the great shock of the Revolution, the triumphs of Marlborough, and the warm dissensions that afflicted the Church in the beginning of the reign of Anne, William Beaw presided obscurely. In early life, he had been ejected from his Fellowship at New College, Oxford, for bearing arms in the Royal cause ; and his College had presented him to the Vicarage of Adderbury, near Oxford. He must have been somewhat advanced in years when he was raised to the Episcopate, and a very old man when he died ; and although he took the oaths to William and Mary, his sympathies were with that large portion of the Clergy, who still favored the cavalier sentiments of his earlier days.

At the death of Bishop Beaw, in 1706, John Tyler, Dean of Hereford, was placed over the neighboring Diocese, and presided eighteen years without translation. The Cathedral, in the mean time, had become so dilapidated, that there was a rumor of a design to transfer the See to Cardiff. But it was not an age when the interests of the Church could arouse any very zealous effort ; and in Wales, throughout the eighteenth century, the Dissenters, appealing to the warm feelings of the people, in their own tongue, became prosperous and prevailed.

The office of Treasurer of St. David's was held in 1724 by Robert Clavering, a learned man, Fellow of University College, Oxford, and Regius Professor of Hebrew at that university. As long before as 1705, he had edited a treatise of Maimonides. He was now made Bishop of Llandaff, but, after four years, translated to Peterborough.

To the next Bishop, Pope has alluded.

"Let modest Foster, if he will, excel  
Ten metropolitans in preaching well;  
A simple Quaker, or a Quaker's wife,  
Outdo Llandaff in doctrine, yea, in life."

This was John Norris, who, after being Dean of Wells, was Bishop of Llandaff from 1728 to 1738, and then died with an irreproachable name. His son, who was Chancellor of Llandaff, Hereford and Dunham, and who published a translation of Justinian's Institutes, left at his death in 1796, the bulk of a large fortune to public charities in London.

The next two Bishops were men who were destined for more conspicuous Bishoprics; but whose names and stations only are remembered. One was Matthias Mawson, who had been Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He was consecrated at the age of fifty-five, and waited no longer than for the first vacancy in any other See; and then, in 1740, was translated to Chichester.

The other, John Gilbert, remained longer. He had been a Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, Rector of a Parish in Devonshire, and Dean of Exeter. It was the period when Ecclesiastical Honors were made most subservient to purposes of State, and to political and family connections; and his promotion, which carried him from Llandaff to Salisbury, and from Salisbury to the Northern Primacy, may have been aided by his marriage to the only sister of the Earl of Harborough.

From 1748 to 1755, Edward Cresset presided, a wealthy man, though not a wealthy Prelate. He, too, had been a Canon of Christ Church, and had married into the family of Pelham, then at the height of political power. As he had a large estate in the Diocese of Hereford, he was the more readily raised to the Deanery of that Cathedral; and when he was transferred to that of the adjoining Diocese of Llandaff, he attempted, with honorable zeal, some extensive and expensive repairs in its dilapidated structure. The false taste of the time, indeed, marred the excellence of the undertaking, by intermingling the Grecian portico and Ionic pilasters with the Gothic and Norman arches.

Unless, indeed, the Prelate himself had a large patrimony, he could so little be expected to build up his Cathedral, that even the expenditures of his station necessarily exceeded his revenues. The Rectorship of Bedwas had therefore been long annexed to the Bishopric; and Bishop Richard Newcome, who succeeded, on the death of Cresset, held that also of Whitchurch, in Shropshire. He was a Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, and a Prebendary of Windsor, and in 1761 was translated to the See of St. Asaph.

John Ewer, an Eton Scholar, afterwards Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, travelled with the gallant Marquis of Granby. The patronage of the great Rutland family, made him Rector of Bottesford, and a Prebendary of Windsor; and, without other distinction, he became Bishop of Llandaff, and, in 1769, of Bangor.

The succession of Prelates at Llandaff has since been far more eminent. Shute Barrington, the youngest of six sons of the first Viscount Barrington, passed from Eton to Merton College, Oxford, and from a Fellowship there, to a Canonry of Christ Church, and was also a Canon of St. Paul's, and Chaplain to George the Second and George the Third. To his marriage to a daughter of the Duke of St. Albans, though he was early left a widow and childless, and to the position of his brother, who was, successively, Secretary of War and Chancellor of the Exchequer, he may have owed his first elevation: the regard of the King secured the rest. In youth, he was not vigorous, and he early sustained an operation for the stone; yet his was the longest Episcopal Life in the annals of the Church of England; for, he was consecrated at thirty-five, and died at ninety-one. Of these fifty-six years, thirteen, from 1769 to 1782, were passed in the See of Llandaff, whence he was translated to Salisbury. The year after his Consecration was that of his second marriage, which was to the daughter of Sir Berkeley William Guise, of Gloucestershire. Not long after, he introduced into Parliament a bill for the prevention of marriage between a divorced adulteress and her convicted paramour; but it had the same ill success which has attended every similar endeavor. Within his Diocese, he founded the

Monmouthshire Clergy Charity. The appearance of Bishop Barrington, exceedingly venerable in his old age, had always been majestic ; and, with his dignity of birth and character, his intrepidity and energy, may have aided an impression which accorded ill with the beneficent tenor of his Episcopate. Thus, in the Pursuits of Literature, a poem of renown in its day, the line is found, as expressive of an impossibility :—

“ Or Barrington be meek, or Watson dull.”

Never, indeed, except as an example of impossibilities, were dullness and the name of Richard Watson united. It is a name to be regarded with some admiration, but with much more of pain and regret ; admiration for powerful abilities and astonishing versatility ; pain, that they added little to the usefulness of the Prelate ; and regret, that either the station or the man had not been other than they were, that so they might have been in harmony. Twenty-eight years before, he had come up to Cambridge from the grammar-school of Neversham, in Westmoreland, of which his father was the Master, and at seventeen had obtained the place of a sizer, or poor scholar, at Trinity College. His reserved and simple manners, his blue yarn stockings, and coarse, mottled, Westmoreland coat, might be passed for a while with neglect, but not long. When he had been at Cambridge six months, he was asked, at an examination, whether Clarke had demonstrated the absurdity of an infinite succession of changeable, dependent beings ; and he coolly answered “ no,” and proceeded to unfold what seemed a fallacy in the argument. His mathematical proficiency won him a Scholarship ; he was second Wrangler ; obtained a Fellowship ; and in 1764, though he knew nothing of Chemistry, he aspired to the vacant Professorship, obtained it, and with it almost immediately obtained, by his industry and genius, a high renown as a lecturer. At thirty-four, with almost as little knowledge of Theology, he sought and obtained, in the same manner, the Regius Professorship of Divinity. The depressed state of Natural and of Theological Science at the University, as well as the great ability of the man, are attested by such a career. “ With no prejudice against the Church of England,

and no predilection for it, but a sincere regard for the Church of Christ," is his own description of his opinions, at the time when he began to teach the future teachers of English Theology. He appealed to the Scriptures alone; but his fitness for the office of an interpreter was not eminent. The truth was, that the close alliance between Education and the Church had pushed into the foremost rank of the ministry, a man of prodigious strength of understanding, of perfect fearlessness, and of boundless independence, without a taste for Christian Learning, and without deep and practical sentiments of Christian Duty. His Religious opinions were very negative; he would have cleansed the Church from what remained, as he said, of Popery and Calvinism; he would not subscribe to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and, though certainly not a Socinian, he vindicated the title of Unitarians to be respected as fellow-Christians. "His majestic and commanding figure," we are told, "his terrific countenance, his deep, sonorous voice, the uninterrupted tenor of his sentences, and the boldness and originality of his sentiments," attracted many undergraduates to his lectures; and even his excessive confidence had its charm, in a monotonous period of the Ecclesiastical System. "Those Scotch metaphysicians," said he, in one lecture, "I have never read, nor shall read; what, therefore, he may have said, I know not; but I will say what he ought to have said." He married the daughter of a gentleman of Westmoreland; and, at a time when it required nearly all that he possessed, he paid the debts of his deceased brother. Through the patronage of the Duke of Rutland, he received the benefice of Knaptoft, in Leicestershire; and his Diocesan, Bishop Keene, gave him that of Northwold, in Norfolk; and, probably, from regard to his office in the University, he was made, in 1780, Archdeacon of Ely. It was also through the influence of the Duke of Rutland, who had been his pupil, that he was raised, in the following year, to the Episcopate of Llandaff. At that time, Lord Shelbourne was at the head of the ministry, and the Duke of Grafton also aided the promotion of Watson; and both these noblemen favored the Unitarian doctrines. Lord Shelbourne expected the aid of so powerful a pen in the defence of his administration;

but he was disappointed. Watson was neither a political partisan nor a faithful pastor. With his left hand, indeed, he spread the broad shield of his Apologies between Christianity and the attacks of Gibbon and Paine; while, with his right, he pushed forth sermons and pamphlets on the liberal side in politics. But he was dissatisfied with his humble See, and, after in vain proposing a plan for equalizing the revenues of the Prelates, retired much from public life, and abandoned some of his highest duties. Retaining his Professorship, he published, in 1785, his somewhat remarkable collection of Theological Tracts, for the use of students in Divinity. His Apology for the Bible ran through fifty editions; the few Sermons which he published were compositions of almost matchless vigor; and he printed many Charges, which were read throughout the Kingdom. But having, in 1786, received, by bequest from one of his pupils, an estate of twenty-thousand pounds, he purchased Calgarth Park, a beautiful seat in the lake country of Westmoreland; and, pleading the want of an Episcopal residence in his Diocese, never, for thirty years, lived at all within its borders. He surrounded himself with plantations of larches; and, as they grew up, he used to say, that, with the poorest Bishopric, he had made himself the richest Bishop in England. In the House of Lords, he upheld the claim of the Prince of Wales to the regency, with full powers; he spoke in favor of the French Revolution, at its beginning, and of Reform in England, and voted for peace with France: yet, afterward, he published a patriotic Address to the people of Britain; and, in the prospect of an invasion, he poured forth a bold and heroic eloquence. He wrote on the expediency of revising the Articles and Liturgy; he would have abolished the disabilities of Dissenters; he extolled their ministers, and was honored, in return, even where there was least agreement of doctrine; and he was once even called, in the House of Lords, "a Dissenting Bishop." But, the manly advocate of Christianity was egotistic, argumentative, secular, ambitious, arrogant, and disappointed, though independent; and when the traveller who came, not to the banks of the Severn, but to those of Windermere, obtained access to the non-resident Prelate, he saw a dignified but vain old man;—a delightful com-

panion, yet insufferably full of himself; wielding over his household the despotism of long selfishness. Neither the Church nor the State was satisfied, and he never obtained the translation which he sought; but was longer Bishop of Llandaff than any of his predecessors since the Reformation. After writing his own memoirs, he withdrew his pen from composition; but preserved his faculties, unharmed by two slight strokes of paralysis. The last sentence which he ever wrote on any religious or literary subject, was, probably, that at the close of the advertisement of his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, in 1815; *ingruit senectus, appropinquat mors, et melioris ævi dies, cum hæc clarius elucebunt*; "old age gathers around, death approaches, and the dawn of a better life, when these things shall shine forth more clearly." On the fourth of July, 1816, he expired, leaving six children, of whom one was a Prebendary of Llandaff and of Wells.

The Bishopric was then given to the hardest polemic, and, perhaps, the most learned Theologian of his generation; Herbert Marsh, at that time Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. Like Watson, he was the son of a Clergyman, the Vicar of Faversham, in Kent; like him, was entered as a sizer, obtained mathematical distinction, and was second Wrangler. After obtaining a Fellowship of St. John's College, he went abroad, in 1785, and sat down at Leipsic; became a member of the University; and, for many years, applied himself to study under the most learned guides of Germany. When the Continent was in a blaze of war, he wrote an *Historical View of the Policies of England and France*, which he published at Leipsic, in English and in German; and, returning to England at the request of Mr. Pitt, declined, at first, but afterwards accepted, a pension. The fruits of his studies appeared, when he began his Lectures at Cambridge; the first Divinity Lectures ever read there in English. He had previously published his *Letters to Travis*, on the disputed passage in the First Epistle of St. John, and his translations of Michaelis. His own Dissertation, which he now added, on the origin and composition of the first three Gospels, in which he supposed a common document to lie at their foundation,



was attacked by Bishop Randolph, and defended by its author. These controversies with Travis and Randolph were followed by one with Belshaw; by another on the educational systems of Bell and Lancaster; and by another against the Bible Society, in which his own share was eight or nine pamphlets, and his position, that to give the Bible without the Prayer Book, was a dangerous sacrifice to the Dissenters. He was a very acute and ingenious controversialist, and his erudition and frankness commanded respect; but he was rather overbearing, and not well acquainted with the modes of persuading mankind, and was better fitted for accurate and logical distinctions, than for the patient examination of evidence. Somewhat singularly, too, he blended a strong zeal for the maintenance of Ecclesiastical Authority, with a tendency, in the interpretation of the Scriptures, if not to the latitudinarianism of Germany, yet, certainly, not to the literal strictness and confiding piety of the older divines. At the age of fifty, he was married to the daughter of a gentleman, whom he had known as a merchant at Leipsic. His *Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome*, published in 1815, was better received than his *Horæ Pelasgicæ* of the following year, when he became Bishop of Llandaff, at the age of fifty-nine. With the Episcopate, he received also the Deanery of St. Paul's; and even his opponents acknowledged the debt which was due for the impulse given by him to Theological Studies, an impulse aided by his manner of speaking, his glistening eye, distinct articulation, and vivid, extemporaneous air. Three years later, he was transferred to Peterborough; but, in neither Diocese, though the ripeness of the scholar and the system of the Professor were united with great energy of character, could all these qualities form the best of shepherds.

Still purer praises attended the next Bishop, William Van Mildert. The grandson of a Dutch emigrant and the son of a London shopkeeper, he passed from Merchant Taylor's school to Queen's College, Oxford; held two or three curacies; was presented by his cousin to the benefice of Bradden in Northamptonshire, and the year after, at the age of thirty-one, was nominated, by the Grocer's Company, to the Rectory of St. Mary-

le-Bow in London. In 1804, he preached the Boyle lectures on the Rise and Progress of Infidelity. Archbishop Sutton gave him the Vicarage of Farmingham in Kent; the benchers of Lincoln's Inn elected him, in 1812, to the honorable post of their Preacher; in the following year he added to this, the Regius Professorship of Divinity at Oxford; and, in 1814, was the Bampton Lecturer, taking, for his subject, an Inquiry into the General Principles of Scriptural Interpretation. Deep learning, accurate thought, clearness of understanding and decision of judgment, prepared him to be the editor of *Waterland*, and the representative and ornament of what might be termed the School of *Waterland*. When he preached, a certain formality and restraint, with which he began, ceased as he warmed with his theme, until he poured forth a rich stream of manly eloquence. He had a strongly reverential and conservative feeling toward the Church and its Doctrines; while his life was free from pride and selfishness; and it was with general approbation, that, after he had held the See of Llandaff and the Deanery of St. Paul's seven years, he was translated to the more elevated dignity of Durham.

His successor, Charles Richard Sumner, was designated, as was believed, by the personal esteem of George the Fourth. He was of a priestly family, whose name is connected with the Provostships of Harrow and of King's College, Cambridge, in a former generation; and his father was Vicar of Kenilworth. Through his mother he was remotely allied to the family of Wilberforce, and he embraced the principles which in his youth were associated with that honored name. He was of Trinity College, Cambridge; and, in due time, became a Prebendary of Canterbury and of Worcester, and a Canon of Windsor. His shining parts, graceful elevation and refined manners attracted the King, who made him his Chaplain, Librarian and Historiographer; and heard, favored, and rewarded, the most faithful and fervent exhibitions of the Gospel. A work on the ministerial character of Christ, which he published, could not but have a blessed influence on the minds of the younger clergy; an influence in harmony with that of the practical writings of his brother, the future Primate. When the Latin treatise of

Milton on Christian Doctrine was discovered, he was enjoined by the King to translate it and prepare it for the press; an office which he ably and elegantly fulfilled. At the age of but thirty-six, he was nominated to the See of Llandaff; but, only a year after, was at once translated to the eminent Diocese of Winchester, now embracing a large part of the Metropolis. During his year at Llandaff, he published a Charge, which flowed from a warm and pastoral heart; and in which he deplored the slender supply of Church Accommodations and Ministerial Services for that great population which almost at once had sprung up in the mining regions of South Wales.

An able successor received from his hands the task of meeting this necessity, and at once, though also Dean of St. Paul's, took a house within his Diocese, and became an efficient resident Prelate. Edward Copleston was also the son of a clergyman, the Rector of Offwell in Devonshire, who lived to see the elevation of his son and pupil. Young Copleston came to Oxford, fresh from the instructions of his father alone, and entered on an Academic career of unsurpassed brilliancy. He gained a Scholarship at Corpus Christi College, from an unusual number of competitors; he won prizes in Latin verse and English prose. Oriel College went beyond its own candidates, to offer him a Fellowship, and he was elected Professor of Poetry, and Provost of that College, which, under his administration, became a centre of the best scholarship of Oxford. There were Whately, Arnold, Keble, Newman, Hawkins, Hampden; and the amiable, enlightened and unprejudiced Provost presided with a happy control over the conflict of tendencies, various, but all earnest. His "Inquiry into the Doctrines of Necessity and Predestination," was welcomed as the calm reasoning of a peculiarly sound and candid mind, and a model of philosophical discussion in Religion. He published also his "Prelections" as Professor of Poetry, and several University pamphlets. In 1826, he was made Dean of Chester, and, entering on his Episcopate in the following year, he sustained, like his immediate predecessor, the Bible and Church Missionary Societies; recorded his vote in favor of Roman Catholic relief, though he had mildly opposed it at first; in favor of Parliamentary Re-

form; and against the admission of Dissenters to the Universities. As the intimate friend of Earl Dudley, he published the correspondence of that nobleman, and paid a just tribute to his talents. In his latter days, his protest against these all but Popish errors, which had lifted their heads in his own Oxford, became both sorrowful and indignant: and one of his last public acts, was a protest against the grant to Maynooth. His death took place on the fourteenth of October, 1849, at the age of seventy-three, and he died without a family. He was buried in Llandaff Cathedral, where no Bishop had been laid within a hundred and seventy-five years.

The choral service had long been extinct at Llandaff, and, in the remnant of the Cathedral, a parish held its worship. Under the recommendations of the Ecclesiastical Commission, however, it was determined that the next Bishop should enjoy an adequate revenue without other preferment; and, when the vacancy was to be now supplied, a warm desire was heard that the new Prelate might be a Welshman, and able to preach in the language of the Principality. This was partly accomplished in the selection of Alfred Ollivant, *Regius* Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, who, though not a native of Wales, yet, having long held the office of Principal of Lampeter College, knew well the Cimbric tongue and the Cambrian wants and spirit. While he addressed congregations in their own language, he applied himself, with evangelical faithfulness, to the task of stirring up his Charge to the relief of the crying spiritual necessities of a population, too much neglected and in danger of alienation from the Church of their country, and perhaps from the Religion of the Gospel.

## ART. V.—HOW SHALL WE READ “THE NICENE CREED?”

“¶ Then *shall be read the Apostles’ or Nicene Creed*; unless one of them hath been read immediately before in the Morning Service.”

*Rubric in Communion Service.*

THE Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A., is a lawful and living branch of Christ’s One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. More than this, it is *the* lawful and National Church, by Divine appointment, of the land in which we dwell. No other Christian body can successfully compete with it, in its claims to the allegiance of American Christians. The erroneous tenets of the Tridentine Missions, and the unsettled doubt concerning the validity of Moravian Orders, render those bodies (the only ones which have rival claims), decidedly our inferiors in Catholicity and Orthodoxy. It is then our mission, as a National Church, to secure and preserve to America the Nicene Faith. If that great symbol of true orthodoxy has been misread or mis-interpreted in Rome, or Paris, or London, there is no reason why it should continue to be abused in New York, or Philadelphia, or Chicago. It is true, (as the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer declares) that to “the Church of England the P. E. Church in these States is indebted, under God, for her first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection.” But this has not prevented the erasure of the Athanasian Creed from our formularies, the optional omission of a clause in the Apostles’ Creed, and other minor changes in various Offices. Thus much has been done, without breaking Communion with the Mother Church. We do not *defend* these changes; we merely cite them to show that every change is not of a necessity a schism. If now we will turn to our Articles of Religion, we shall read:—

*Art. VIII.—Of the Creeds.*

The *Nicene Creed*, and that which is commonly called the *Apostles’ Creed*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed;

for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

This Nicene Creed, we are directed in the Communion Rubric (placed at the head of this article), to read publicly in the Church on certain occasions of Public Worship.

Now, it is a curious fact, but one which can be easily verified, that there happens to be, in our Prayer Book, no Creed which is declared to be "the Nicene Creed." There is indeed a Creed printed immediately after "the Apostles," and prefaced by the Rubric, "¶ *Or this,*" which commonly passes for "the Nicene Creed." But a careful examination will show, that this is neither the Creed of the Council of Nicæa, nor "the Nicene Creed," as confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon, and still used by all orthodox Churches of the East, as the symbol of their orthodoxy. Great changes have befallen it, in the lapse of time, as history will easily show.

It is known to all, that the Emperor Constantine the Great summoned the first General Council of the Christian Church, which met at Nicæa in the year of our Lord, 325, and put forth the following Creed, as the final condemnation of the Arian heresy:—

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητὴν; καὶ εἰς ἓνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, Φῶς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα, καὶ σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς· καὶ ἐρχόμενον πάλιν κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς· Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, κ. τ. λ. . . .

"We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father only—begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God: begotten, not made; of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things on earth; Who, for us men and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate, and was made man; suffered, and rose the third day, and ascended into the Heavens; and is coming again to judge living and dead. And in the Holy Ghost. And those who say"—(here follows the anathema).

Such was the short and simple Creed of the Nicene Council. But the heresy of Macedonius (which denied the true Personality of the Holy Spirit) having arisen, a Second General Council was summoned, which met at Constantinople in the year 381, and completed the Creed of Christendom with the following articles:—

*Τὸ Κτίριον, τὸ ζωοποιῶν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν Καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἵωνος. Ἀμήν.*—"The Lord, the Life-Giver, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the Prophets. In One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge One Baptism for forgiveness of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and life of the world to come. Amen."

These two portions taken together, make up the common and established Faith of Christendom, the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, called, by the Council of Ephesus and by Christians subsequently, "the Nicene Creed." This is, undoubtedly, "the Nicene Creed" spoken of in our Rubric and Articles. In the final version, established by the Council of Chalcedon, there were a few variations from the original version of the Nicene Council, as we shall see.

The (third) General Council of Ephesus, at its sixth session, July 22, 431, S. Cyril presiding, solemnly decreed (Canon VII) the inviolability of the Nicene Faith. The ordinary reader can find the original Greek of this Canon in Macaulay's Hist. of Eng., Bk. III, chap. 14.

"The Holy Synod decrees that it is permitted to no one to offer, or to write, or compose, another Faith besides (*παρά*) that defined by the Holy Fathers assembled in Nicæa with the Holy Ghost. And those daring to compose another Faith, or to bring forward or offer it to those wishing to turn to the knowledge of the truth from Hellenism or Judaism, or any other heresy whatsoever, if Bishops, shall be thrust out of their Episcopate; if Clergy, from their Clerical office; and if laymen, shall be anathematized."

We can hardly conceive of a more solemn warning against the tampering of *individuals* with the Faith. But it is absurd



to argue (as Stanley does) that the Chalcedonian Creed violated the Ephesian Canon. One General Council cannot bind its successors, any more than one Congress can pass laws incapable of amendment.

A Congress has no right to violate the Constitution; nor a General Council the "most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." Within these limits, a true and undisputed General Council, assembling to-day, might mould the Nicene Symbol into any form which the interests of the common Faith demanded. But we question the right of Pope, Patriarch, or local Synod to do this, without prejudice to the VIIth Canon of Ephesus.

The (fourth) General Council, which met at Chalcedon in the year 451, exercised its right of remoulding the Creed by omitting the phrases "Begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father; God of God,"—"both things in heaven and things on earth,"—with the anathema; and it added the words and phrases, "of heaven and earth, and,"—"Begotten of the Father before all worlds,"—"from the heavens,"—"of the Holy Ghost and Mary the Virgin,"—"crucified for us under Pontius Pilate,"—"and was buried,"—"according to the Scriptures,"—"and is sitting on the right hand of the Father,"—"with glory,"—"of Whose kingdom there shall be no end." The Nicene Creed thus changed, and with the additions of Constantinople, was solemnly confirmed at Chalcedon, and has never been changed by any later, undisputed General Council. And thus we are bound to recite it, if we would not incur the condemnation of Ephesus.

But the Creed in our Prayer Book, which, very properly, is *not* called the *Nicene* Creed, but is labelled, "¶ *Or this*," varies from the Creed of Chalcedon in several particulars. With the exception of the (apparently accidental) omission of the word HOLY before the word "Catholic," it is a literal translation of the *Latin* version of the Nicene Creed, which has been used for eight or nine centuries in the Papal Churches of the West. The most important of these alterations, is the famous addition of FILIOQUE in the Article which treats of the Procession of the Holy Ghost. The history of

this innovation, was thus given in brief on the floor of our last General Convention.

"At the third Council of Ephesus, called and being general in its character, a decree was passed, declaring that whoever should hereafter propose, or propound, or make, any other Creed than the Constantinopolitan-Nicene Creed as necessary to be needful for salvation to any heathen, or Jew, or heretic, converted to the true Faith, such person so proposing it, if a clergyman, should be deposed, and if a layman, anathematized. This decree of the Council of Ephesus is so important, that I venture to predict, that, if ever the peace of Christendom is restored, it will be by virtue of that decree, which I say has never been actually gainsayed by any Christian Church. Some may suppose that the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England gainsay that decree of the Council of Ephesus; but they do not, and we have never presumed to alter for the Christian world any of those XXXIX Articles, which embrace the Nicene Creed. The Church in these United States is prepared, on these questions, to offer her arms to all Christians. This Creed, the Constantinopolitan-Nicene, generally called *the Nicene* alone, did not originally contain the words, '*and the Son,*' in the clause relative to the Procession of the Holy Ghost; but subsequently, during one of the middle centuries, a small Council in Spain undertook to introduce the words, '*and the Son,*' commonly called the *Filioque* clause. Immediately there was a reclamation, and the Pope [Leo III], hearing of the assumption, not only rebuked the introduction, but caused two silver plates to be put up, with the clause omitted." [A later Pope, however, (Nicholas I), gave his sanction to the innovation.] "In process of time, the clause grew into use, and became inserted in the Creed. Then the Greeks, basing their principle on the authority of the General Council, denied that any addition could be made to the Creed *without the intervention of a General Council*, of which they must necessarily, with their three (or four) patriarchates, form a part. But the evil still continued, and a disruption was occasioned, *chiefly from that cause*, between the Eastern and the Western Church."<sup>2</sup>

To the like purport are the memorable words of the great Bishop of Chester, whose treatise on the Creed is a standard of orthodoxy in all Anglican Churches:—

---

\* Dr. H. M. Mason's Speech on the '*Filioque Memorial*,' 1865.

"Thus did the Oriental Church accuse the Occidental, for adding *Filioque* to the Creed, contrary to a General Council, which had prohibited all additions, and that without the least pretence of the authority of another Council; and so the schism between the Latin and the Greek Church began and was continued, *never to be ended until those words FILIOQUE are taken out of the Creed.*"\*

The next most important variation in the English Creed (as distinguished from both Greek and Latin), is the entire omission of one of the four notes of the true Church, the word HOLY. This has never been accounted for, except as an inexcusable typographical blunder, and would of itself warrant a demand for the revision of our Creed. The words "God of God," which were in the first Creed of Nicæa, were formally omitted by the Council of Chalcedon. By what lawful authority have they been re-inserted in the Creed? The Greek standard uses the plural form throughout: (*We believe, etc.*)—the Latin has changed it to the singular number, rendering it thereby less fit for a *Communion* Creed. The Greek says, "*of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*"—the Latin, "*by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary.*" "The Lord and Giver of Life," should read, "the Lord, *the* Giver of Life." All other variations from the Greek are of trifling importance. For convenience of reference, we will now give in parallel columns, the authorized Greek, and our version of it.

"*The Nicene Creed.*"

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ, καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀορατῶν. Καὶ εἰς ἓνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν μονογενῆ τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς, γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων· Φῶς ἐκ Φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ· γεννηθέντα, οὐ ποιηθέντα· ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί· δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο· τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν· καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· στάνωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ

"¶ *Or this.*"

I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God. Begotten of his Father before all worlds; *God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by Whom all things were made; Who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for*

\* Bishop Pearson on the VIIIth Article of the Creed.

ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς· καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.

Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. Εἰς μίαν ἉΓΙΑΝ. Καθολικὴν καὶ Ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν. Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. Ἀμήν.

for us under Pontius Pilate. *He* suffered and was buried; and the third day *he* rose again, according to the Scriptures; and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and *he* shall come again with glory to judge *both* the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

And *I believe* in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the prophets. And *I believe* in one \* \* \* Catholic and Apostolic Church. *I* acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; And *I* look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

On comparing these Creeds together, and noticing their differences, great and small, the candid and thoughtful Churchman will naturally ask some questions.

1. Is the Creed, ‘¶ *Or this,*’ really and truly “the Nicene Creed,” of which mention is made in our Article and Communion Office?

2. Are we not, in reciting it, perpetually violating the VIIth Canon of the General Council of Ephesus, a Council, whose binding authority the Church of England and our own fully recognize?

3. As long as we persist in this course, can we reasonably hope for re-union with a very important part of Christendom?

4. Is it necessary for our National Church to wait for the Mother Church of England, to get the permission of the Prime Minister, or parliament, before we venture to obey the decisions of the General Councils, which all recognize?

These are not (we trust) impertinent questions, and we expect the General Convention to answer them for us. It would be a dangerous license for each individual clergyman to make his own translation of the Nicene Creed, for use in the Church. And it would be un-Catholic to omit all use of the Nicene Creed.

It is indeed a matter of surprise that the English Reformers did not complete their great work by restoring the Creed to its true Catholic form. England, at that day, was too remote from the East to understand fully the bearings of the *Filioque* controversy. Even the Patriarch Cyril Lucar (who was rather Calvinist than Orthodox) does not appear to have noticed or regarded the point at issue. The first mention of it that we remember, was by the Commissioners for a review of the English Prayer Book, in 1689, who stated in a note their opinion, that something ought to be done to the Nicene Creed to satisfy the Greek Church and maintain Catholic Communion. "But this great and good work miscarried at that time." It was revived by the non-juring Prelates, who stated, in their proposals to the Greeks, "that they assented to the Oriental Faith in the matter of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, and that, by the *Filioque* clause, they meant no more than, '*from the FATHER by the SON.*'"

To this, the Patriarch and Synod reply, (Constantinople, April 12, 1718),—

"We answer, that we receive no other Rule, or Creed, than that which was settled, and most piously set forth, by the first and second holy General Council; in which it was decreed, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father; for it says, 'We believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father.' Therefore *we receive none who add the least syllable*, (and the most perfect word would fall far short,) either by way of insertion, commentary, or explication to this Holy Creed, *or who take anything from it*. For, the Holy Fathers, at that time anathematize all such as shall either take from, or add to it, any word or syllable."

"If any one has formerly inserted any word, *let it be struck out*, and let the Creed be unaltered as it was first written, and is, to this day, after so many years, read and believed by us. Now, concerning this point, we thus believe that there is a *two-fold Procession* of the Holy Spirit: the one, natural, eternal, and before time, according to which, the Holy Spirit *proceeds from the Father alone*; and of which it is both written in the Creed, and the Lord has said, '*the Comforter, whom I will SEND unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which PROCEEDETH FROM THE FATHER,*' (John xv, 26). The other Procession is *temporal and deputative*, according to which, the

Holy Spirit is externally sent forth, derived, proceeds and flows from both the Father and the Son, for the sanctification of the creature."

"As to His temporal and outward Procession, we agree that He proceeds, comes, or is sent *by* the Son, or *through the Son's mediation*, and *from the Son*, in this sense of an *outward* Procession, for the sanctification of the creature."

But this *πρόεσις*, or mission, we do not call Procession, lest we should be as unhappy as the Papists, who, because of the limited dialect of the Latin language, which is unable to express the *πρόεσις*, or mission, by one word, and the *ἐκπόρευσις*, or Procession, by another, have called them both Processionem; which afterwards grew into error, and made them take the *eternal* Procession for that *πρόεσις*, which was *in time*."

The question of a revision of the Creed, commonly called the Nicene Creed, was brought before our last General Convention in a Memorial signed by a single presbyter. The Memorial erred, in asking only for relief from the *Filioque* clause, and not for a general revision of the Creed. Yet this would hardly have been a modest request for a single individual to make. The report of the Committee of the Lower House, to which the Memorial was referred, while it denied the petition on grounds of *expediency*, fully conceded the facts on which the request was based. The subject, we believe, will be renewed in our next General Convention, and (we hope) under more favorable auspices. The method has been recently so ably pointed out, that we cannot forbear to quote the very words of the author.

"What is needed, is, that the next General Convention appoint a proper Committee, to set forth, in Greek and English, the *Nicene Creed* mentioned in the *VIIIth Article*, as containing the summary of the Catholic Faith. We want the unaltered Greek of Constantinople; no Latin paraphrase. We want, beside, the best and most honest English version possible, from our best scholars—a version which, in clear, plain English, shall convey (as clear, plain English, better than any language on earth, *can*,) the unquestioned sense of the original, plain, clear, Greek.

We want these versions spread authoritatively upon the Journal of the Convention, as the thing referred to in the *VIIIth Article*, for all reference, and to decide all matters of doubt.

Beyond that, nothing may be necessary at the next Convention, except to allow such clergymen and congregations, as may choose to use the English version so set forth, in public worship, instead of the faulty one now printed in our Prayer Books. In process of

time, when custom has made us familiar with the truer version, its use may be made universal.

For, manifestly, the mere omission of the words 'And from the Son,' will not meet the requirement of the Article. There are still several insufficient translations, and one very serious omission. It is a note of the Church that she is *Holy*. The Nicene Creed declares her so—'One, *Holy*, Catholic, and Apostolic, Church.'

These are the four notes or marks of a true Church. We omit the second. We express no belief in a *Holy* Church. The omission of this word is another instance of the blind and unreasoning conservatism, that sometimes passes for wisdom and sound prudence. The word seems to have dropped out of the early English version by a mere error of the press, and conservatism has embalmed the printer's blunder; and the Church of England and our own, from that day to this, at some compositor's or proof reader's bidding, have ceased to express any faith in a *Holy* Church, and the same compositor has done what the General Council of Ephesus declared should never be done—has changed the Catholic Faith!

It is really time, we submit, that the Church should look at this matter, and free herself from the very queer position, of teaching, as the Nicene Faith, either the interpolations of a Pope, or the blunders of a type-setter."



## ART. VI.—THE AMERICAN CHURCH IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE.

The attention of American Churchmen has of late been drawn, more and more, to the subject of what may be called the European field of our Church's responsibility. In the opinion of some of those best acquainted with the facts, the last few years have,—each year more plainly,—laid upon the Church a new and solemn *duty*, and at the same time opened to her, as peculiarly her own, the opportunity of exerting an *influence*, the extent of whose possible and ultimate results for good, can, perhaps, scarcely be exaggerated.

The discharge of that *duty* and the exertion of that *influence*, seem, at first sight, to be entirely distinct, and even to move in almost opposite directions; for it is the duty of providing for the spiritual needs of her own children on the one hand, and it is the exertion of an influence upon the members, and ultimately upon the very constitution itself, of foreign communions, on the other. And yet, in practice, the one would be found so dependent upon, and so closely intertwined with, the wise and efficient discharge of the other, that, however distinct theoretically, the attempt both to fulfil this duty and to exert this influence, would, to a very considerable extent, involve the development of but a single policy.

The *first*—the duty thus referred to—is one somewhat unique; one, not to be determined by any simple inductive discussion of the *theory* of the Church. It is confessedly an abnormal duty, (and, let us hope, a temporary one,) resulting from an abnormal state of the Church. It is the consequent of the fact, that great numbers of the children of our Church, and still more of other Americans, are continually travelling, sojourning, or even residing, in countries nominally Christian, and where the native or local provision for Christian Worship, and for preaching the Gospel of Christ to the hearts of those who have not yet received it, are not such (aside from the difficulty of language,) that the Church can entrust to them the discharge of her own solemn responsibility for their souls.

For many years past, the number of Americans visiting Europe has been rapidly increasing; and, since the close of our civil war, several causes have combined, suddenly and greatly, to raise the ratio of this increase. They may now be numbered by scores of thousands, and they are found, at the appropriate seasons, thronging the great routes of European travel, and the chief centres of European attraction. It was laughingly said, last summer, that there were in Switzerland more Americans than Swiss themselves; and every traveller can testify, that, between our English cousins and our own countrymen, English is everywhere the principal language at the *tables d'hôte*. And the causes of this fact are not being accidental or transient, but found in the very location of our country and in the characteristics of our people.

A large proportion of these Americans are children of our Church, for whose spiritual care *none* will deny that the Church is responsible. All of them are children of a people, to whom very many Churchmen claim that the American Episcopal Church has an exclusively authoritative mission. Here, then, is a distinct, and, it may almost be called, *nomadic* portion of our countrymen—of our Church; steadily increasing as a whole, however it may shift and change occasionally, for the religious care of which our Church *must* be acknowledged to be, either wholly or in large part, directly responsible.

The question arises, then, how is that responsibility to be discharged?

In a state of normal purity and unity, the Church, in every part of Christendom, should be able to provide, or to include within her polity due provision, for all such needs. But under present circumstances, not diversity of language alone, but, still more, diversity, serious diversity of Faith and Worship, prevent our Church from trusting the spiritual interests of her children to any of the religious agencies or provisions of the nations of Continental Europe.

Putting it upon the broadest possible footing, and aside from the consideration alike of *Worship* and of what *we* should regard as sound Church teaching, to what extent would pulpit

instruction be found in Europe which would embrace even the *essentials* of evangelical truth? A single reflection upon the character either of French Mariolatry or of French Protestantism, of German, Dutch or Swiss Rationalism, or of the doubly corrupt Romanism of Italy, will sufficiently answer this question. The traveller by no means finds even a *Père Hyacinthe* in every Roman Catholic, or a *Monod* in every Protestant pulpit in Paris; he will be far more likely to hear a disciple of *Strauss* than of *Hengstenberg*, in Berlin; he will certainly hear the doctrines of *Servetus*, not those of *Calvin*, at Geneva; and he cannot yet count upon a Reformer, at either *Il Gesù* or *San Carlo al Corso*, at Rome. It scarcely needs more than to be thus referred to in plain terms, to expose its utter absurdity, and American Churchmen would of course protest against any such acceptance of the provision which Continental Europe yet makes for Christian Teaching or for Christian Worship. It is well enough, however, to be reminded of the fact.

But has the Church done much better in acting as if this provision *is* enough; or if not so, then, as if travellers and sojourners and residents abroad left their souls, with their several needs and temptations and dangers, all at home, in the charge of their faithful pastors, and in their old Parish Churches? This may seem to be using strong language. Of course, no man—bishop, priest or layman—ever deliberately accepted either of these alternative hypotheses; nor is it probable that there has ever been much deliberate consideration of the subject whatever; or, so far as there has been, it has sufficed that there were the English Chapels. We will speak of these in a moment; but, to leave them out of the question for the present, what has *our* Church done, or what have Churchmen done in *any* organic capacity, to provide for these needs? The Church has merely enacted that "*it shall be lawful*" for Churchmen abroad to provide for themselves; and two or three individual clergymen have acted upon that permission.

Let us try this policy, by the Church's own course, towards a different field; her provision for needs far less unlike these for

which we now plead, than many think. Children of the Church and colonies of our people, to all of which she acknowledges herself a debtor, are scattered, and are multiplying over the broad far West. Does the Church merely enact, that "it shall be lawful" for *them* to organize congregations, call and settle Clergy, and attach themselves to a distant Presiding Bishop? No. She has organized a Committee to procure men and money for them; she has appointed Bishops to go out to that far territory, to gather them together, to rouse them, to save them from the dangers or the habits of godlessness; to remind them, in some instances, of their Mother Church; to gather them, in all, to the fold of Christ. In fine, the Church herself sends after them the Gospel which they had left behind, the Holy Sacraments, and the bidding to that sweet and solemn Worship, whose influence they, perhaps, once felt in their early home, but which, in these wild new scenes, they would else have been in danger of almost utterly forgetting.

But if these same persons had turned their steps eastward, instead of to the West; if, instead of the Mississippi Valley, they had crossed the Ocean; if, instead of the rough, and, in many respects, not unhealthy contests of a new society, they were going into the midst of the dissipated and luxurious worldliness of an old society; if, instead of the absorbing and materializing struggle for a foothold, and an upward career amid the hard, practical working realities and energies of a pioneer life, they were *only* to be exposed to the corrupting influences of superstitions or the poison of infidelity—if their religious habits, and even their moral principles, were in danger of being relaxed by the influence and example of communities, whose religion is either a dreary speculation, or an unreal and lifeless inheritance:—*then* the Church has for them only a, "Go, and God be with you; *it shall be lawful* for you to do whatever you can or feel disposed to do for yourselves."

We fully admit that the Western field, whether as part of our own national territory, or on the score of numbers, or of the future issues dependent upon the present prompt action of the Church, has the *greater* claim of the two. We do not intend to urge a comparison, save only so far as to insist that the

same principles, which have constrained the Church to enter upon so wise, and so vigorous a Missionary policy in the one case, ought to protest against her negligence in the other.

We fully admit, also, that the need of such a provision for Americans in Europe is one which has only lately taken important proportions, and which is only now beginning to be realized ; and there is not as yet the ground for deserved reproach, that there would be should this neglect continue.

The Church of England, recognizing this responsibility on her part towards *her* children, has, either through the Foreign office, or through one or two of its great societies, colonized *her* Chapels over all Europe ; and has thus abundantly provided for the religious needs of English Churchmen, travelling or sojourning on the continent. And—although, indeed, the number of Americans is now probably fully equal to that of the English—does not this provision, it is often asked, suffice for both?

Perhaps so, with the exception of a few places ; but it is not a question of room and accommodations. It certainly would be wrong not to acknowledge gratefully the freedom with which these provisions have been ever and everywhere extended to American Churchmen also ; and they can never forget the affectionate relations they have, in very many instances, been privileged to maintain with English Chaplains, whom they have learned to regard as they would a Pastor of their own Church. But waiving the question, (well worthy, however, of being discussed,) how far our Church is justified in merely abandoning to the Church of England and to the English Chaplains, the discharge of her own responsibilities—in neglecting *her own* duty, because another part of the Church is partially fulfilling it ; let us consider the practical working of this acceptance of the English Chapels as a sufficient provision for the religious needs of Americans. The experience of the American Episcopal Church, in Paris and Rome, and the brief experience of the Episcopal Chapel in Florence, during the winter of 1860–61, afford some materials for a comparison.

Such is the feeling of a large part of the Americans towards England, and towards everything that is English,—a feeling

which (whether it verges upon hostility, or amounts to little more than a certain sense of strangeness,) may be deplored ; but the existence of which *it is impossible to deny*, and which *it would be folly to ignore*; that, even where there is no American Worship whatever, the majority of Americans will not; and do not, attend the English Chapels. Very many Episcopalians even, and much the larger part of the non-Episcopalians, prefer to attend Scotch, or Swiss, or other European Protestant Worship, *or even to go nowhere at all*.

The national feeling is so strong, especially of later years, that this need must and will be met by the provision of *some kind* of American Worship and pastoral care. If not supplied by our Church, the field has been already, in some, and will be in yet other instances, occupied by a non-Episcopal or so-called "Union Church," which is, of course, attended by all American non-Episcopalians, and, also, by all those Episcopalians (*and their number is larger than may be supposed*) who realize, the force of the national tie drawing them in one direction, more than the unity of Faith and Worship between our own and the English Church drawing them in the other. The fact, moreover, that these "Union Churches" are sometimes called by their friends, *Episcopal Churches*, upon the strength of *the use, half of the day, of a mutilated part of our Service*, entraps many who would not otherwise have attended them. But if, on the other hand, this need is, from the first, supplied by an American *Episcopal Church*, it is at once and thenceforward attended and supported by all the Episcopalians; and even by a large proportion of non-Episcopalians also. These last attend and support such a Church, *and have done so*, in spite of its being Episcopal, *because* of its being American. And (save in Paris, where the number of Americans is amply sufficient to demand and maintain several different places of Worship) it is very doubtful whether an American non-Episcopal would be so much as opened in any place where an American *Episcopal Church* had been already established.

To content ourselves with saying, that the English and American Churches are, substantially, one, and that the members of both should unite heartily in attending and sustaining

one Worship, is undoubtedly true. But does the Church realize what is the result? It is, to commit the most devoted Churchmen to the care of the English Church; to leave another and full as large a part to such a provision as may be made by American non-Episcopal or Union-Chapels; and to abandon the more careless, those very persons whom the Church, like her Divine Master, ought to be seeking and saving, to the easily acquired and *very usual* habit of not going to any place of Worship at all. And more than this, it would be to renounce the opportunity, which would otherwise be in her power, of exerting a Churchly influence, and imbuing with Church teaching a large body of Americans, who, though rarely or never attending the Church's services at home, are willing to commit themselves to her care, and to avail themselves of her provisions for Worship in Europe. Denominational Societies are becoming alive to these facts, and one of them has, apparently, entered upon a policy of establishing Union Chapels in different European centres, which our Church has not occupied, and while *she* is talking about the sufficiency of the provision made by the English Church.

An illustration of this, if we are well informed, has been found at Florence. Before 1860, there was no American place of Worship there. A part of the American Episcopalians attended the English Church; but *very far from all*, and very few non-Episcopalians. These latter, generally attended the Scotch Chapel. But, in that year, an American Episcopal Chapel was opened, under most acceptable ministrations; and, during the following season, it was attended by nearly all the church-going Americans, residents and travellers, of whatever name. *After* our services were interrupted, and *our* Chapel closed, a Union Chapel was opened, which has since been, and is now, attended and supported by all the American non-Episcopalians, and also by a large proportion of the children of the Church. There are two English Chapels in Florence; but it is a rare thing to see an American at either. Yet our Church has said, these English Chapels are sufficient: and so has left her children to a Chapel, whose "charity" is so comprehensive, that, among others, it has furnished to them the eloquent in-



structions of a distinguished Unitarian divine. This Chapel styles itself the "*American Church*," and,—as part of our Liturgy is used in the morning,—some call it, and others think it, an American Episcopal Church. Are not these things worthy of being guarded against?

If, then, the Church is to predicate her practical policy upon *the actual facts*, instead of upon *theories and opinions of what ought to be*, she must determine at once, whether she will assume the duty of providing, as far as possible, for the religious needs of American Churchmen travelling, sojourning, and even residing, abroad; and, in so doing, secure the opportunity of influencing a large proportion of non-Episcopalians also: or whether, for the sake of an *abstract theory* of unity with the Church of England, she will continue to commit her children to English care, for the most part *only in theory*, but really, to turn them over to the choice between Union Chapels, and the very easily acquired habit of neglecting Public Worship altogether; and, at the same time, as we have said, to throw away the opportunity, thus within her power, of recovering many of those who are now strangers or aliens to her Worship and her Faith.

But after all, even thus, would the Church really secure the end purchased at so great a cost? Would she show forth the unity between the Church of England and herself? The true theory of unity between the English and American Churches, was revealed during the organization, and, we had hoped, *settled* by the practical experience, of the Anglo-American Church in Paris. It was then and there confessed and proclaimed, as it had before been virtually proved, that the essential unity of the two Churches is *far more* clearly manifested, and *far more* deeply impressed, both upon their own children and upon foreigners, by the sight and experience of the two Churches working side by side, each in its own way, and upon its own mission, but *conjointly*; exchanging pulpits with each other, and uniting, upon special occasions, interchanging the advantages of Episcopal offices, &c., than by the suppression of one in the presence of the other, and the fact that, in consequence, *some* American Churchmen attend English services.

If *this* were proof, it would equally prove some other Ecclesiastical propositions, perhaps not quite so acceptable. On the one hand, it would prove that several English dissenting bodies are one with the Established Church,—for they have no Chapel in Paris, and some of their children, in consequence, attend the English Church; and, on the other hand, it would prove, that in Naples, *we* are one with the *Scotch Free Kirk*, for we have no Church there, and, in consequence, most of the Americans, Episcopalians included, attend, and *are building a Church*, for the very able and worthy Scotch Presbyterian minister.

Indeed, the English Chaplains themselves, in whose behalf, in part, this plea is frequently made, and the objection urged to opening an American Church,—often understand this perfectly, and are the very persons to be anxious for an American Episcopal Church; well assured, that there must and will be, either that, or some other provision for Americans; and, of course, greatly preferring an *ally* to a *rival*, if not an *enemy*.

Leaving this subject here, for a few moments, let us turn to consider the opportunity which is offered to the American Church, of exerting a valuable, and perhaps permanent influence upon the Ecclesiastical and Religious future of European Communions. This subject need not, however, be more than briefly touched upon.

It is the opinion of many who have carefully studied the present condition of Europe, that the whole religious mind of the Continent is on the eve of great changes. Such, unquestionably, is the fact in France, Germany, and Italy. The French Gallican school is once more struggling to regain a footing, and its former power and privileges:—the Austrian and the Hungarian Churches are already beginning to adjust themselves to the great political and social revolution, which has taken place in that Empire, with singular indifference to the teachings and orders of Rome: and in Italy, while the whole nation is throwing off the Ecclesiastical bondage of the past, a movement for an internal reformation of the Church itself has actually begun.

Under these circumstances, the Anglican Church has a great opportunity of influence: and the more widely, and the more

thoroughly the history and principles of her own reformation, the primitive character of her ministry and discipline, the Catholicity of her Faith and Worship, are known,—the more her power for aiding the great movements will be extended and increased. But there are two facts which commit this power to the American Church in a peculiar degree ; or, rather, which especially fit her for discharging, *though conjointly* with the English Church, her own *distinct* and *independent* part of this instrumentality.

1st. The relations between the English Church and the State prevent her Chaplains, in many instances, from entering freely and actively upon any such policy, and forbid them to make their Chapels the basis of any such influence. The instances can be cited, in which the English Foreign Office peremptorily forbade a Chaplain, even to distribute translations of the Prayer Book; and in which an English Chaplain has not felt at liberty to come into personal relations with the reformers by whom he was surrounded, or even to have one of them come to his house ! In more than one instance, they have called on American Clergymen to take certain steps, or to carry out given measures, whose importance they deeply realized, but which *they* were debarred from touching.

*Secondly.* In many instances—certainly in Italy—it is questions of Ecclesiastical polity, which first and chiefly engage the attention of the reformers; it is precisely here, that the reform movement must evidently secure its first foothold; and it is in this connection, that the opportunity of exerting an influence is first offered to our Church. But the established, and *apparently* State-governed condition of the Church of England, is precisely that, from which these men shrink; while the distinctive polity of the American Church exemplifies the very principles which can alone solve the first great practical problem of Italian Reform.

Now, it is resident Clergymen,—men who have become familiar, not only with the language, but also with the characteristics, the mental and moral habits, the prejudices, tendencies, and needs of such reformers, and who can, moreover, gradually mature personal relations with them, one by one,—

who can alone know just how and when to approach them, and how most wisely and judiciously to make them acquainted with our Church, and to bring our influence to bear upon them. And it is only from American Episcopal Churches, established among them, under their own eyes, that they can learn what the Ministry and Worship and external characteristics of our Church really are.

Such established American Episcopal Churches or Chapels, with their due appointments for Divine Worship according to our own customs, and under the charge of able, faithful, learned, wise and godly Clergy,—so far as such can be secured, (*men who are especially selected as suitable representatives of our Church*)—such Churches, therefore, as will most thoroughly fulfill the duty of providing for the spiritual needs of Americans, travelling or resident in Europe, are exactly such as will furnish the fittest agents, and the only true basis for the exertion of our Church's influence in aiding, guiding, and supporting, the reform movements, or the modifying elements in the Church of Italy, or in other of the European Communions.

The first steps in the realization of such a policy should be, the occupation of those great central points,—one each, at least, in France, Italy, and Germany,—which combine the two requisites of being centres of American sojourning, and also centres of national influence. In France, Paris, of course. In Italy, Rome is the most important place, from the *first* point of view. Florence, which comes *next* to Rome, as a centre of Americans in Italy, is *first* in importance as a basis for the exertion of our influence. In Germany, there has long been expressed a desire for an American Church at Dresden, which is also, probably, as good a centre of active influence as any.

Of these posts, Paris, Rome, and Florence, are already occupied, and the American Church established. Dresden\* *must* soon receive attention; and Naples\* affords a most valuable

---

\* There were about 500 Americans, young and old, in Dresden last winter; and between 300 and 400 in Naples. In the former place, the number of English was not 300; yet *they* were provided with two English Churches, of different grades of Churchmanship.

point for finding at once an American basis, and an Italian field of usefulness.

But, to carry out any such scheme with energy and decision, money, and well-chosen Chaplains, and (to develop it with any fullness, unity and comprehensiveness,) immediate and constant Episcopal supervision and direction are necessary.

Experience has *thus far* proved, that such American Churches are nearly, if not quite, self-supporting,—that is, that the Americans desiring religious enjoyment and benefit from these services, have ever been ready to provide amply for the support of the ministry, and for the other current expenses. This will probably be found the case in yet other instances, although in some, it will, perhaps, be necessary that the experiment should be assured by a guarantee.

But, so far as means are needed for such guarantees, or for other purposes, in carrying out such a policy as is here contemplated—whether for the provision of American services for our fellow countrymen, or for assisting reform movements among Europeans—(unless it may be in the exceptional instance of the erection of a Church edifice), it is probably only necessary that they should be asked for and expended by persons, known to and possessing the confidence of the Church, and *under due Ecclesiastical sanction and authority*, to obtain all that may be required without making any appeals at home. There are a large number of wealthy and liberal Churchmen constantly in Europe—some residing there and others coming and going—in a position to appreciate and take an active interest in such a work as this, considered in either of its aspects, and, at the same time,—largely if not entirely relieved from the innumerable demands which would press upon them at home,—to support abundantly and efficiently every necessary agency.

But it is also important, both in order to secure the confidence of such Churchmen and for success in either of the proposed directions, that the clergy placed in charge of such American Churches or Chapels, or otherwise representing the American Church in the midst of foreign Communions, should not be such, as might *chance to present themselves* for such services ; but such, as have been carefully and conscientiously

selected by wise and responsible agents—as qualified, as far as possible, to occupy the position of representative men set in stations of no little difficulty and of peculiar responsibility.

Europeans and European Churches will judge of our Church by those who represent us in their midst, however they may have come there. And nothing proves more strikingly how utterly the American Church has, thus far, failed to realize her responsibility to the religious future of the world, than her failure to throw any safeguards around the delicate and yet solemnly important work of representing her before the eyes of the Romanists and the Protestants of the Continent of Europe.

And, finally, it is absolutely necessary—whether for obtaining means and for securing the selection of proper clerical representatives, or for the accomplishment of any comprehensive scheme, and, especially, to attain any unity of action, that there should be added the immediate superintendence and personal presence in Europe of a BISHOP, who should be elected and commissioned by the General Convention, and who should have jurisdiction over all American Churches, upon the European continent. By this we do not mean merely in France, Italy and Germany, but in Athens also, where we have long had an important Mission of our Church without any American Episcopal oversight. And such a Bishop should be a man capable of taking the lead, ably and wisely, though of course in due subordination to the Church itself, in the important part which is manifest our Church will soon be called on to play in the inter-national or Œcumenical relations of European Christendom.

Such a Bishop should not be sent to Europe with any quasi-*Diocesan* authority or jurisdiction ; nor, on the other hand, should he appear to have any such *Missionary* character as will seem, even by implication, to reflect upon the religious systems or principles of those among whom he is sent. *There should be involved, if possible, in the very title which he bears, an admission of the special, exceptional and temporary character of his office.* There should be, in such a step, no appearance of founding a Bishopric or establishing a See ; but only

the provisional sending out of an officer of the Church, duly commissioned to provide for the spiritual needs of her children, to take the oversight of her interests, and to represent her in the midst of other Communions, while such an abnormal necessity unhappily continues. Such a *Bishop Delegate*, as he might perhaps appropriately be termed, could be classed, for purposes of our own convenience, with Domestic Missionary Bishops ; but he should be regarded rather as bearing a special commission, than giving precedent for a continuous office. Upon the death of the first Bishop Delegate, there would then remain no vacancy to be filled as a matter of course ; the Church would send out another or not, according to the circumstances and needs of the time.

Upon the question of precedent for such a step we will not enter ; but, however novel in some respects it may perhaps be thought, the circumstances which demand it are also equally unprecedented ; and it must be the teaching of the *spirit*, not of the mere *letter*, of past Church history, by which the Church must be guided in adapting herself to the requirements of an unprecedented age.

We are not forgetful that a Resolution was reported by one of the Committees of the Lambeth Conference, almost totally at variance with the policy which we urge. The 7th Resolution of the Report of the Committee appointed under Resolution xi. of the Conference, (a Resolution, by the way, which had reference solely to Missionary Bishoprics and the subordination of Missionaries,) was to the effect, "that, with respect to the special case of Continental Chaplaincies, the Committee suggest to the Conference the consideration of some Ecclesiastical arrangement, by which the various congregations of the Anglican Communion may be under one authority, whether of the English or American Church."

Now, our reverence for the Lambeth Conference and the high estimate we place upon the importance of its results, is most unfeigned ; nor would we willingly fail in respect for the opinion of one of its Committees : but we must beg leave to say that this resolution was prompted by *theoretical* considerations only ; and that it would be found in practice, not only



fatal to the interests for which *we* are now pleading, but destructive of the very end which the Committee had in view, i. e., the manifestation of the unity of the English and American Churches. We firmly believe that the attempt to act upon such a suggestion would be one of the surest means of making trouble between the two Churches, in the very face of those foreign Communionings which we wish to impress with the spectacle of our unity.

Of course, in no sense could an English Bishop be a representative of the *distinctive* characteristics of the American Church; nor an American Bishop, of those of the English Church; but aside from this consideration, let us regard the suggestion only in the light of the purpose, which no doubt prompted it, and glance at the probable practical working of such a policy.

The American Clergy, having respect, as they would have, only to Ecclesiastical law, would *of course* submit to the jurisdiction of an English Bishop, if so bidden by their Church, but it is easy to conceive of circumstances in which such relations would be most embarrassing to either party. Had the Gibraltar Bishopric, for example, at its late vacancy, been united, (as we believe was seriously proposed), to the office of "Chaplain to the Forces," the American Clergy, subject to the Prelate filling that See, would have been indirectly subject to the exigencies which must govern an official of the British Army. It is easy to imagine the endless difficulties, which might arise between an active and zealous American Clergyman, accustomed only to regard his duty before God and to his own Church, and a cautious English Bishop, obliged to be upon his guard lest he should compromise his Government, by giving his official sanction to an even apparent interference in the affairs of a Foreign country. American Clergymen love their Mother Church of England, and they venerate her Bishops, alike for their high office's sake, and on account of their learning and personal worth: but they are by no means enamoured with the system by which they are selected. They remember her relations to the British House of Commons; and they reflect that if the Government can, at one time, sustain *one* Colenso in a South African See, it can, at another, appoint another

Colenso or a Stanley, to a European See; and they cannot believe that the American Church will expose them to any such a risk.

On the other hand, there are, upon the continent, far too many English Chaplains, who are accustomed to regard the authority of their own Bishops as derived solely from acts of Parliament, to make it at all probable that they would generally submit to any attempt of an American Bishop to assume jurisdiction over them. We are not, in our turn, indulging in speculations, but writing what we *know* to be the fact, when we repeat that some of the English Chaplains,—who would most respectfully and most cordially welcome an American Bishop as a *guest* in their Churches or coming to perform any Episcopal office on behalf of a Bishop of London, or of Gibraltar, or of Heligoland,—would yet positively refuse to acknowledge the *jurisdiction* of any other than an English Bishop. There are, indeed, not a few who scarcely acknowledge the authority of their own Bishops, or do so, only as a matter of courtesy, on the ground that the enactments of the English Parliament have no force upon the continent; and we can assure the Church, that the teaching of the Lambeth Conference must be far more thoroughly accepted than it has yet been, before it can venture to try so bold an experiment as to assign a number of *English* Chaplains, taken geographically in any part of Europe, to the jurisdiction of an *American* Bishop.

But the unity of the two Churches would indeed be shown forth in the only true, because in the only natural, manner, if the American Church, selecting one of her ablest divines, a man whom she would be willing to set before European Christendom as her representative, and taking advantage of the presence of those English Bishops, who, we believe, it is expected, will attend our next General Convention, should send him forth,—an American indeed, but uniting once more in his own person, both successions,—as a *Bishop Delegate*, to provide and care for her scattered children, and to tell others of the work God has given *us* to do, and the special witness He has commissioned *us* to bear, in this age of religious changes, to Catholic Truth and to Catholic Polity.

Side by side, let the American Church thus take her stand, *with* the Church of England upon the European continent, at once distinct and different, and yet the same; mingling and interchanging services, yet not confounding jurisdictions. Neither absorbed by the other, but united in the same great work, let them bear double and joint witness before the world to the Catholic character of a Communion, which, preserving the same Primitive Ministry, and holding the same Ancient Creeds, has adapted itself alike to Monarchical and to Republican institutions, and which, if in slightly different accents, yet in the same vigorous tongue, preaches the same Faith as it is in Jesus, in the Old world and in the New.

## ART. VII.—FROUDE'S ELIZABETH.\*

*History of England.*—By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A.  
New York : Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

THE age of Elizabeth was the age of the sword. As the Church and State subsisted together, the cause of the Church passed then under the arbitrament of steel. The Reformation therefore was now to prove its right to exist, by abiding the shock of arms wielded by some of the most inveterate and subtle enemies, that ever assailed a great truth or attempted to trample down a great right. It was reserved for Elizabeth and her statesmen to conduct affairs in behalf of the most fundamental and holy privileges of the Anglican Church. In this Essay we study their behaviors and their fortunes.

It has been shown already, how Elizabeth arranged her domestic affairs and managed the several Ecclesiastical parties, which, as we think, endangered the English Reformation. But, as she saw, and as all Churchmen know, her final and most astute enemy was Rome. Peace for Christ's people on English soil, was to be conquered out of the hands of one, who, calling himself the Vicar of Christ on earth, has never failed to use his opportunity to crush out, with a high hand, and by the aid of the armies of his vassals, all reformation that dared to challenge his own supremacy over Christians. The self constituted Vicar of the Prince of Peace, in the age of the Reformation, became a devotee of the sword, and reposed his faith in those papal armies, which reddened Holland, Switzerland, Germany and France, with the blood of the martyrs of Reform.† The history of the Papal assault on the liberties of

\* Concluded from the July number, 1867.

† It has already been explained in a preceding paper, how Rome attempted to reach England, chiefly in two ways. 1st, by invasion. 2d, by domestic insurrection. And how these two connected themselves together in a perpetual menace against the Crown. Invasion might come from France, from Scotland and from Spain, or from all three together. It was the Pope's craft, to unite England's enemies against her. It was Elizabeth's statesmanship, to divide them. Most of the diplomacy of her reign concerned these disputed purposes.

the Anglican Church, especially in the first half of Elizabeth's reign, is to be found by the student of our Reformation in the story of Mary, Queen of Scots.

Mary, Queen of Scots, daughter of the eldest sister of Henry VIII. and James V. of Scotland, sent as an infant out of the kingdom to avoid the civil commotions of the times, was educated at the French Court. She became the wife of the heir to the French throne, and was, during all her life, a constant, if not a pious, Romanist.

Her husband, Francis II., died in 1560, and by the exigencies of that kingdom, and her own hereditary right, she became Queen of Scotland, whither she now removed.

Her new realm adhered, at her accession, to the Reformation. It had been watered by the blood of some of the purest martyrs, who have ever died by fire or sword for the testimony of Jesus, and as against the Pope. The peasants and the artisans of Scotland held the reformed doctrines in a great human love, as austere, perhaps, as the skies under which they dwelt, but as inflexible as the granite of Scottish hills. With them were allied the most learned and pious of the National Clergy, led by that Spartan Reformer, John Knox. But, among the upper classes, and at Court, the Reformation was hardly more than an uncertain and wavering sentiment, and many adhered to the Roman obedience. The nobility of the age, ruffianly robbers of each others' lands, and oppressors of the poor, thought vastly more of sharing a confiscated estate, or of revenging with the dagger some recent affront or ancient feud, than of acquiring a correct theology, or of maintaining the liberties of the Scottish Church. The temper of the times was coarse, licentious, lawless, passionate, brutal. Property was insecure, and justice most uncertain. The Scottish Reformation had made its way against, both the drift of the Scottish temper, and the fashions of Scottish life. Yet it had made its castles in the cottages of honest peasants, and in the hearts of a few brave, far sighted leaders, while its enemies or careless friends held the wealth and the station of the realm. It was over such a people that Mary assumed the rule; and Scotland, she determined with a vow she followed all her life, should

obey Rome. As far and as fast as she could, she reëstablished the mass everywhere, and in her private chapel, at her first coming, followed the Roman Rite, while men with swords kept back Scottish indignation from disturbing the unseemly worship. The Reformers knew her from the start, and Knox himself paid due heed to the wily persistent brain and passion of the woman, who was to wage a very dangerous and subtle war against the Faith of the Reformation. It is not meant to attempt to analyze the elements of Mary's nature, or to narrate the story of her reign in Scotland. As to herself, the stain of that French Court, where purity in woman or honor in man were myths, runs through all her public life. She came to Scotland, young, a widow, and most beautiful; yet, when need was, and the times served, she was iron to crush her opponents, and bold, far-sighted and unscrupulous, in the enlargement of her plans. Bred in luxury and delighting in the effeminate pleasures of the Court, she could outweary strong men in the roughest rides across the country, and, although a woman, where even men might pity or hold back, she was cruel, and without mercy when she reached out to touch her aim. Beautiful as Helen of Troy, like Helen she confused kingdoms, and wrought ruin upon brave men by the charm of her most singular and fatal beauty. Without the shadow of purity about her, she could assume the artlessness of a child. A match for Elizabeth in intrigue, she surpassed her sister in all those feminine arts and graces, which especially belong to women. In her reign, she swore falsely, murdered, and shocked even her own age by a display of the very delirium of lust; and yet some have affected to find in her a saintly Queen. In short, she was by far the most dangerous woman that ever assailed the Reformation. The danger to England was, that, in the eyes of English Romanists, she was lawful queen of England; and her son, as James I., actually succeeded Elizabeth on the English throne. This right she claimed, and never remitted to her death. But if, by Elizabeth's death, or by force, Mary could gain the English Crown, Rome would be restored to England at her coronation. Therefore she watched for the time, when, aided by French soldiers, she might invade a realm

torn by domestic insurrection, and conquer down the heresy that denied the supremacy of the Pontiff; and, for her coming English Romanists watched through many weary years.

It does not lie within the scope of this essay, as has been said, to narrate the story of Mary's reign in Scotland. Divested of her own personal intrigues and marriages, the object of that reign was two-fold: I. To establish Romanism: II. To win somehow the English crown.

In both undertakings, she received the support of papal France. French gentlemen thronged her Court, French soldiers garrisoned her castles, French gold paid her hirelings, and bribed a venal nobility to her support. As against Scotch Reformers she fared but badly, and, though she led them a long chase, they finally hunted her from her throne to a prison. As against Elizabeth, in the years before she became her prisoner, Mary fared no better. She perplexed, deceived and made uncomfortable, her English sister, by ever varying and dangerous plans for her disgrace or overthrow; and Elizabeth returned her the full measure of her unfriendly offices. It was Elizabeth, who aided the Scotch Reformers against their Queen, when the latter assailed the Reformation; balanced party against party in Scottish politics, so that neither France nor Mary should have leisure to assail England too sharply; and who, at the last, as the result of her policy, saw Mary a captive in her own realm and hands. Mary, as is well known, became Elizabeth's prisoner.

When Mary, as Queen of Scotland, was so well watched in an English prison, that her power to aid Rome against Reform was limited, Rome was preparing in another quarter another instrument, with which to smite down the Anglican Church and Crown.

It is right to draw the portrait of the man, who, at the bidding of Rome, was about to lift the sword against the English Reformation. A small, meagre person, under-sized, narrow-chested, with the shrinking air of an habitual invalid, and, at the same time, the reserve and hauteur of his Spanish blood; broad forehead, blue eyes, aquiline nose, and a heavy, far-protruding, under jaw, and a vast mouth; of fair complexion, hair



light and thin, his beard yellow, short, and pointed ;—such, in looks, was the man, whom God suffered, in a mysterious providence, to become the deadliest foe of the Reformed Religion. His behavior in public was quiet, silent, almost sepulchral. He had the habit of looking on the ground, whenever he talked with man or woman. Deceitful, reticent, merciless, his dagger followed close upon his smile. Outwardly cold, he had the lowest passions in him, but never, in his latter days, a generous impulse of any sort. Scantly educated, and not over fond of war, his will was the fountain of some of the most cruel wars recorded in history, and he accomplished upon mankind, what few of the loftiest genius and the profoundest lore have ever brought to pass. He inherited, in middle age, an Empire so vast, that on it the sun never set. The fairest and richest provinces of America were his, and his rule was owned in Africa, at the Capes, and in the farthest Indies. His subjects were of all colors, races, tongues. His ships were on every sea, and, at his will, they brought whatever was choice, valuable, or magnificent, to adorn his Court or magnify his Reign. His also were the ablest captains, the stoutest soldiers, the most famous navies. But his was a strange nature. Devout as the monks, whom he often rivalled in the austerity of his penance, though he knew the secrets of the wildest debaucheries; superstitious, beyond any of the priests who surrounded, to enlighten him in those profound theological questions which were the diversion of his leisure hours;—he was an instance of a man possessed of the most accurate faith, and the very worst of works. Always a most servile son of the Roman See, he never passed the portrait of Pope Pius V., father of the Inquisition, without taking off his hat to it. In his youth, he had affected the pomps and vanities of his imperial station ; but, as he aged, he left them all, and, retiring to the solitude of his palace, proceeded with the great business of his life. It was to destroy Protestantism ; not to subdue or bind it, but to extirpate it ; to dig it up, root and branch, out of the heart of the human race ; to burn it up ; to scatter its ashes to the four winds of Heaven ; so that, henceforth, in the light of the sun and in the sight of men, there should be no sign, or token of it, save the

•

battle-fields where it had died under the sword, or the market-places where it had been consumed by fire. This idea became in him the wildest fanaticism. As St. Louis and the Crusaders had broke the Saracenic rule in Christendom, so he would destroy the new Infidels against Christ and Holy Church. Wherever he could reach a Protestant, he smote him. Wherever there was an arm to strike Protestantism, he strengthened it; wherever a mouth to curse, he fed it. Seated in his library, with guards to keep off intruders, and a map of Europe before him, he planned to consign kingdoms to the sword and flame for their Religion. Unmoved as stone, he wrote letters to his Generals and Governors, which reddened Holland with blood, and made thousands widows, and tens of thousands orphans; but he wrote on, as though every stroke of his pen were not a blow of agony. A letter from him built a scaffold, or set a stake in the most distant province. The wail of smitten peoples reached him, praying mercy; a nation perished under his hand; but he heard no prayer, and, receiving news of the agony of human souls, without the slightest emotion, kept to his letters. Distrusting all men, never violent, always silent, patient, inexorable, his life was spent in destroying the Faith as we receive it.

There is no man in history quite like him, nor, had he been human, a man who should have suffered so. His first born and only son perished a prisoner in his own palace,—a Protestant, men say,—and this father came in silently, and, standing behind the guard, made the sign of the Cross over his sleeping boy, and then went out again, and never saw him more. If he had had conscience, no man should have slept so ill, for the accusing victims of his wrath rising in dreams before him; yet few slept more soundly. In short, here was a monster in the pay of Rome,—the master enemy of Elizabeth and her Religion. He is named in history Philip II.

While Philip was inaugurating and carrying on his Crusade, Mary, Queen of Scots, in prison, had become a chronic conspirator against Elizabeth's Crown and the Reformation sheltered beneath it. Rome had determined to revolutionize England, and to array the English papists in insurrection against their Queen. They were forbidden to conform to the

new uses in the Anglican Church, though many of them were willing to do it; and Romish emissaries, traversing the kingdom, stirred up strife, and plotted treason wherever they went. Elizabeth's life was in constant danger, and it is well known, from public documents, how that papal piety had plotted to take her off by poison or the dagger, as chance might serve. Mary, next to the Pope, it was thought, would profit most by Elizabeth's death, as then the way seemed open to the English Throne; and to crown Mary, was to enthrone the Pope. Mary's prison, therefore, was the center of domestic insurrection. The great English Lords, like Norfolk, who rose in arms against their sovereign, spoke her name as their liege lady. Insurrection drew its inspiration from the captive Queen. Her most faithful servants were convicted and executed, for foul conspiracies against Elizabeth; and yet Mary, for a long time, escaped. Thus, gradually, England came to rest upon a volcano, while, on every side, armies were gathering against her. Philip was moving in his plot. It was the days of the St. Bartholomew massacre in France. In Holland, William, Prince of Orange, and the friend of Reformation, had just died, under the assassin's knife. Assassination, Rebellion, Invasion, threatened the English throne. Mary, the prisoner, willing or unwilling, was their representative in England. It was a State necessity that she should die. Parliament had, on divers occasions, demanded her trial, and now, if not according to law, yet in exact justice, she was to be destroyed, as the heart of much that afflicted England. She was tried upon the charge of having conspired against the Queen's life, and condemned to die.\* She died as a Queen, and in her grave were buried some of the fondest hopes of English papists.

The man, who sat in the closet of his palace of Madrid writing letters, heard of Mary's death with his usual composure. He knew very well why the blow was struck, but he himself had a blow to strike, and he set about it with greater assiduity than before. Of late, his letters had increased. To every Roman Court, and to Rome itself, he had written of his great undertaking. He it was, who would strike off the head of

\* The charge may not have been proved; but it was certainly never disproved.

Protestantism, and give its foul carcass to the birds of the air and the beasts of the field, in the sight of God and man. The passion of the Crusades was upon him. Christ's insulted sepulchre was now in England, and the Infidels who surrounded it, were Elizabeth and her Court. Philip would deliver Jesus Christ with the sword. The silent man, with the heart swallowed up by wild fanaticism, had been long preparing for this very work. Through all his dominions, at Genoa, and Venice, and Naples, and in Sicily; in Spain, Holland, and Germany and Denmark, ships were hired or built for him. His galleons, laden with treasure, were ordered home from India, or Mexico, to pay his armies. Soldiers were gathered everywhere. The most valiant Knights, the most experienced Captains of the Roman Faith, entered his armies as volunteers, or directed operations. Across Europe, from every Papal realm, soldiers were marching toward the English Channel. Europe looked to the man who sat writing letters at Madrid, for the word that was to unloose the thunder.

Meanwhile, Elizabeth and her Statesmen made ready for the storm. Philip gave out, that all these military preparations were for the Indies; but she knew that Philip lied, and that, just across the Channel, in the Netherlands, there were thirty thousand veteran troops, under the ablest Captains, and innumerable flat boats in Holland creeks, ready to land these soldiers on the English strand, and that Roman Europe was praying in all its Chapels, Oratories and Churches, for her overthrow, and that his priests had promised Philip victory. It was now, when the crisis of Elizabeth's life was come, and the question was to be answered by the sword, whether Protestantism should exist any longer among mankind, that her Tudor courage rose to the level of the danger. Not waiting for Philip's blow, she sent a fleet into Spanish waters, which made such havoc among his ships, that it delayed his venture just one year. Meanwhile, England armed, and troops gathered. In the summer of 1558, Elizabeth knew that Philip's fleet was about to sail from Spain for London. It was said, that he had ordered, if the Queen was captured, she was to be carefully kept, as she was to be sent to Rome,—so prudently did Philip dispose of his lion's skin, before he caught his lion.

The invincible Armada sailed from the Tagus, May 29, 1588. The weeks that elapsed before it appeared in the English Channel, were weeks of most grievous suspense. The English fleet, inferior in numbers and in the size of its ships, scattered along the Channel Coast, watched for the invader's sails. The English forts were garrisoned. A hundred and twenty thousand men were under arms. Between London and Gravesend there were more than 50,000 men. Elizabeth, in armor and surrounded by her Lords, betook herself to camp. Everywhere the men in the ranks cheered her. Two Earls held her horse's bridle, while she addressed her army. "I have come to die among you," she said, "but I scorn that Spain, or any prince of Europe, should dare to invade the borders of my realm." Daughter of Henry VIII., and of the Tudor blood, the heart of England thrilled to her martial words.

July 19th, an English pirate, who yet loved his country, cruising off the Channel mouth, ran his ship into harbor, with news that the Spanish fleet was off the Lizard point, and standing in. Drake, the sailor who a year before had crippled the Spaniard, was ashore with his captains, playing bowls, when the tidings came. He said, "Play out the match. There is time enough to finish the game and the Spaniard too." And the sailors played out the game. Then they warped their ships out of harbor against a head wind, and went to find the enemy. The next day, Saturday, July 20th, they saw, for the first time, the Invincible Armada. It was a fleet of 130 vessels, and near 3,000 guns, with 20,000 land troops, besides the sailors, and 2,000 volunteers from the noblest families of Spain. It carried also a multitude of priests, equipped with crosses and rosaries, and other Roman merchandise, with which to convert the English heretics. It was also said, that the Inquisition had some of its most subtle and delicate instruments of penitence and devotion on board. As the fleet sailed up the Channel in a crescent shape, from horn to horn it measured seven miles. The English fleet followed, and hung upon its rear, waiting for chances. Meanwhile the beacon fires, blazing on all the Channel cliffs, told England that Spain had come. As the grand fleet swept on, some of the slower Spanish vessels

dropped a little astern. The English fell fiercely upon and captured them. Seeing this, the Spanish Admiral shortened sail, and called his ships around him. The English held back, waiting. That night, one of the Spanish ships perished by fire, and the English admiral was re-inforced. The great Sir Walter Raleigh also joined him. Then they followed the Spaniard again. They found him off Portland harbor, and fought him all day, keeping well off from his large ships, and, pouring in their fire, they crippled many ships, and captured some. Thus they sailed, and fought all that night. In the morning, the Spaniard had lost all stomach for the fight, and, shame to say, the English had no powder. Towards night, however, a new supply came on board, and next morning, July 25th, they overtook the Spaniard off the Isle of Wight, and fought him till the powder was gone again. July 26th found the Armada sailing up the Channel with a fair breeze, England following. The English Admiral had resolved not to fight until he reached Dover Straits, where he expected re-inforcements. The Spaniard, had he been wise, would have sailed on to Dunkirk, where a small English fleet kept 30,000 Spanish veterans and their flat boats cooped up in Holland. It was fated, that he should stop in Calais harbor. Thither England gathered all her ships. Fire ships were sent among the Spaniards, as they lay at anchor. Panic-stricken, and handling their ships so miserably, that many were damaged by falling foul of each other, and some destroyed by fire, the Armada scattered its ships out of Calais harbor and fled up the North Sea, England following until both bread and powder failed him. The English sailors, when they turned from the enemy, saw him sailing into those dangerous waters between Norway and Scotland, where winds and tides seem to hold a singular enmity against mankind; and these winds and tides smote the Spaniard bitterly. He attempted to sail round Scotland; but the jagged, rocky coast of Scottish bays and islands received as wrecks the ships that the tempests cast ashore, and a few vessels only of the great fleet escaped to Spain.

Meanwhile 120,000 Englishmen waited with swords, and their Queen rode in armor; and, meanwhile, God had answered,

by the decision of battle, the question whether the Reformation should exist any longer in this world, so that, if it be true to itself, neither Philip, nor Pope, nor Inquisition, nor Armada shall cause it to perish. In this second venture, Rome had lost. The silent man, who wrote so many letters, dictated by a merciless vow to exterminate all that affronted the supremacy of Rome, had been foiled by a woman, whose hand he had once asked in marriage ; yet, we know, it was God Who gave the victory. When Philip heard that his Armada was destroyed, he fell on his knees and gave God thanks that it was no worse. Philip was so used to lie, that he did not mind a falsehood before his God ; but, upon his knees, he knew that it was bad enough ; that, in spite of labor, bloodshed, stake and axe, his life, at its very centre, was a ghastly failure ; for, that in England, sheltered beneath a mighty Sceptre, a Faith that he called heresy offered its Sacraments and fulfilled its offices for all coming time. The controversy had not been between Philip and Elizabeth ; but between Philip and Philip's God.

From the destruction of the Armada, to Elizabeth's death, was a period of about fourteen years. But they were years, when Mary was dead, and Philip was growing old. The laurels, which her great Captains had won for her, and the far-reaching-plans of her statesmen, gave her a power in European politics, and she used it wisely, upon the whole, in behalf of Reformation. The closing of her reign, albeit traitors still existed, and Rome was ever ready to strike again, was in a measure prosperous and tranquil. The Puritans, greatly moved to new ways in Religion, were to prove, two reigns farther on, the quality and the courage of these restless Radicals in the Church ; but Elizabeth restrained them. Both that which was best, and that which was worst, in Elizabeth, intensified themselves as she became aged ; yet she was always Henry's daughter, and England's Queen. Her virtues must be carefully discriminated from her defects ; and, after three hundred years, much remains unintelligible concerning this great, strong willed, subtle-minded, greatly tried Queen of the Sword that defended the Faith in the trial hour of the Reformation. It has not been attempted to describe her reign, in its magnificence and genius,



but merely, to narrate the story of the defence of the English Church against enemies.

In March, 1603, Elizabeth was on her death bed ; fast going to God for judgment. Mary had gone thither before her ; so had many of the great chiefs, who, on sea and land, in both hemispheres and under many banners, had fought great battles, either for or against the Reformation. So had also the Spaniard Philip. Nigh five years before Sept. 13th, 1598, the man, who wrote so many letters that made nations weep blood, was dead in his Spanish palace. He had wrought hard to resist God, and he had matured great plans, with a ceaseless and boundless craft, mendacity and deceit, and the plans had failed. His reward is, that history writes of him, "If Philip possessed a single virtue, it has eluded the conscientious research of the writer of these pages. If there are vices—as possibly there are—from which he was exempt, it is because it is not permitted to human nature to attain perfection, even in evil." "He endured the martyrdom of his last illness with the heroism of a saint, and died in the certainty of immortal bliss, as the reward of his life of evil."

Elizabeth died March 24th, 1603, in the 70th year of her age, having reigned nigh 44 years in England. It was her fortune, during her reign, to be a party to that tremendous struggle, from which the Church conquered the right to live ; and the name of Elizabeth is associated with the most stormy years of the Reformation. In her grave, and with her Queenly name, are still associated the memory of those great Statesmen, Captains, Poets and Scholars, which will render the Elizabethan age and name forever famous.

## ART. VIII.—PRESENCE IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

*Declaration signed by the Rev. R. S. Littledale, LL.D., D.C.L.,  
and other Clergymen of the Church of England, May, 1867.*

*Charge of the Bishop of Salisbury, May 20, 1867.*

THE connection of Dr. Pusey with the Tractarian movement, the dreams of his Eirenicon, and his known advocacy of Ritualism, often make his very truth suspected error. Our chief design, under the title of this Article, is to ascertain whether his recent Declaration is in any measure consistent with the Faith of the Church, so that the man holding it may be esteemed orthodox and loyal. In such an investigation, charity should certainly desire to see lifted the cloud obscuring so illustrious a name, and to discover that the beauty of meek dignity, adorning the Scholar and Divine, is not wholly severed from Eternal Truth.

And here, it may be remarked, there are extreme views in reference to both Sacraments of the Church. By some, Baptism is divested of every sacramental token, stripped of all mystery, and reduced to a mere consecration of its subject to God ; while, by others, it has been converted into a charm, and made operative in conferring present sanctification and final salvation. The safe and Scriptural opinion of the Church, sustained by the Ancient and Anglican Fathers, is, that it removes the stain of original sin, introduces into the covenant of grace, and implants a germ of holiness, which may perish by neglect, or be fostered into an Eternal Life.

There are those, also, who hold that the Holy Communion is but a Memento, a Pledge, a Bond, a Confession, a Dedication. They despoil it of what most touches sensibility and awes into reverence, conforming it to the former severity of their doctrine and their architecture. On the other hand, Rome, with anathemas, fastens to it the monstrous dogma of transubstantiation, by which the glorified Body of our Lord, nay, according to the Decrees of Trent, His very Soul and Divinity, pass into the persons of the recipients.

Dr. Pusey and his associates concluded, many years since, that there is more in the Holy Communion, as inculcated by the Standards of the Church, than was exhibited in her practice. In a celebrated sermon, condemned by the University of Oxford, he stated, "Were it *only* a thankful commemoration of His redeeming love; were it *only* a showing forth of His death; were it *only* a strengthening and refreshing of the soul, it were indeed a reasonable service, but it would have no direct healing to the sinner. To him its special joy is, that it is his Redeemer's very broken Body; it is His Blood which was shed for the remission of sins." Subsequently he used this more emphatic language: "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist has been termed sacramental, supernatural, mystical, ineffable, opposed, not to what is *real*, but to what is natural. It is a Presence *without* us, not within us only. Since it was the true Body which was given *for* us on the Cross, it is his true Body given *to* us in the Sacrament. The manner of the Presence of the Body is different. The Body which is present, is the same."

Now, beyond question, these words, literally received, are strong as any Romanist could desire. They have been honestly believed by thousands to teach the absurdity of transubstantiation. Just as obviously they are capable of a spiritual interpretation. Charity will rejoice if it be found from Dr. Pusey's recent declaration, he never intended them in the sense of his opposers. This paper, signed by himself and several other clergymen of the Church of England, contains the following exposition of his opinions.

1. "We repudiate the opinion of a corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood; that is to say, of the presence of His body and blood as they are in Heaven, and the conception of the mode of His presence which implies the physical change of the natural substances of the bread and wine, commonly called transubstantiation.

"We believe, in the Holy Eucharist, by virtue of the consecration, through the power of the Holy Ghost, the Body and Blood of our Saviour, Christ, the 'inward part, or thing signified,' are present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, under the outward visible part, or sign, or form, of bread and wine.

2. "We repudiate the notion of any fresh sacrifice, or any view of the Eucharistic sacrificial offering, as something apart from the 'all sufficient sacrifice and oblation on the Cross, which alone is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world,' both original and actual, and which alone is 'meritorious.'"

"We believe that, as in Heaven, Christ, our Great High Priest, ever offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading, by His presence, His Sacrifice of Himself 'once offered' on the Cross, so, on earth, in the Holy Eucharist, that same Body, 'once for all' sacrificed for us, and that same Blood 'once for all' shed for us, Sacramentally present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the Priest, as our Lord ordained to be done in remembrance of Himself, when He instituted the blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood."

3. "We repudiate all adoration of the Sacramental bread and wine, which would be idolatry."

"We believe that Christ, Himself, really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably, present in the Sacrament, is to be adored."

The charge of the Bishop of Salisbury, read during his visitation to Dorchester last May, and which drew forth a protest from a number of his Clergy, expressed opinions, in regard to an *objective* presence, virtually similar to the Declaration. Thus, the whole subject has, in England, recently excited the deepest interest and the most varied comment.

In comparing the Declaration, first with the opinions of the Greek and Latin Fathers, while it must be remembered, that they often expressed themselves, not in precise and formal language, but rather with a glowing eloquence kindled by a warm Christian sensibility, it must, also, be observed that their words of Faith and Love, burning like the altars of Heaven, are very different from the chilling and passionless descriptions of those esteeming the Holy Eucharist only a commemorative observance. We will often recognize language, recalling the expressions in our own Communion office.

St. Ignatius says,—

"They abstain from Eucharist and Prayer, because they confess not that the Eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Christ."

Justin Martyr says,—

"For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these, but in like manner, as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, having been made Flesh by the Word of God, hath both Flesh and Blood for our Salvation; so, likewise, have we been taught that the

Food which is blessed by the prayer of His Word, and from which our blood and flesh, by transmutation, are nourished, is the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus Who was made Flesh."

St. Irenæus says,—

"But how shall they know certainly that the bread, over which thanks are given, is the Body of our Lord, and that the cup is the cup of His Blood, if they do not acknowledge Him as the Son of the Creator of the world?"

Clement of Alexandria, referring to Christ, says,—

"I am thy nourisher, who giveth thee Myself—Bread of which whoso tasteth, no more tasteth death, and Who daily giveth thee the drink of Immortality."

Origen says,—

"Who both giveth thee the Bread of Blessing, His own Body, and bestoweth on thee His own Blood."

Dionysius, the Great, says,—

"But the Lord Himself and God of Israel saith, 'Whoso eateth Me shall live by Me.' It is God Who dwelleth in us according to the Covenant."

St. Athanasius says,—

"Our Saviour, also, since He was changing the real for the Spiritual, promised them that they should no longer eat the flesh of a lamb, but His own, saying, 'This is My Body and Blood.'"

St. Jerome says,—

"Nor hath Moses given us the true bread; but the Lord Jesus, Himself Guest and Banquet, Himself eating with us, and Him, Who is eaten—His Blood we drink, and without Him we cannot drink. He came in the Flesh that we might eat Him, and He remaineth with the Father that He might feed angels."

St. Augustin says,—

"So then He both gave us, of His Body and Blood, a healthful refreshment, and briefly solved a question of His own Entireness:—*Eat Life; drink Life*; Thou shalt have Life, and the Life is entire. But thus shall it be, the Body and Blood of Christ shall be each man's Life, if what is taken in the Sacrament, is eaten spiritually, and drunk spiritually."

St. Chrysostom, "the golden mouthed," with his unrivaled beauty and power of eloquence, awed and transported before the mystery of the Sacrament, awakens in us something of his own wonder and reverence. He says,—

"Think with thee, O man, what sacrifice thou art about to touch, what table approach. Lay it to heart that thou, being earth and ashes, takest part of the Body and Blood of Christ. God invites thee to His own Table, and setteth before thee His own Son. Let us draw near, and approach the King of Heaven. Wherefore, it is necessary to understand the marvel of the mysteries. He hath given to those, who desire Him, not only to see Him, but to touch and eat Him, and to embrace Him, and satisfy their love. Let us, then, return from that table like lions, breathing fire, terrible to devils. This Blood causeth the image of our King to be fresh within us, produceth beauty unspeakable—calleth to us angels and the Lord of angels—is the salvation of our souls—was poured forth to make Heaven accessible: awful in truth are the mysteries, awful in truth is the altar. A fountain went forth out of Paradise, sending forth material rivers: from this table springeth up a fountain, which sendeth forth rivers spiritual. This fountain is a fountain of light. By it stand the Powers on High, looking upon the beauty of its streams, because they more clearly see the power of the things set forth, and the flashings unapproachable. They, who share this Blood, stand with angels, and the Lord of angels and archangels, and the Powers that are above, clothed in Christ's own kingly robe. Nay, I have not yet said any great thing clothed with the King Himself."

It may be here incidentally observed, that the forms of expression, in all the most ancient Liturgies, in regard to the Body and Blood of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, resemble many from the Fathers, and are often identical with those of our own Communion Office.

But we proceed to remark, that Gregory the Great, impressing on the Holy Eucharist still more the idea of Sacrifice, supposes represented to the believing heart the redemptive Sufferings of Christ, whereby man becomes reconciled to God, When the Priest offers, Heaven opens; choirs of angels appear; the earthly and Heavenly unite; the visible and invisible are one.

In the course of ages, the tendency to more sensuous conceptions, constantly increasing with the deeper darkness of the world, culminated in the Ninth Century, in the views of Paschasius Radbert. He says,—

"If thou believest in the miracle of the Incarnation of the Son of God, thou must believe, also, in the miracle which is wrought by the same divine power, through the words of the Priest. The same Body is here present as that in which Christ was born, suffered, arose and ascended into Heaven."

The opinions of Ratramnus were in direct contradiction to those of Radbert. He supposed that the Divine Word, dwelling in the Body of Christ, unites itself with the bread and wine, which, becoming media for the communication of the Eternal Logos, are called, in an improper sense, the Body of Christ.

Berengarius, in the Eleventh Century, seemed inspired by an intense ardor, in his zeal against a corporal presence in the Holy Eucharist. He wrote; he spoke; he protested. He was condemned as a heretic. His book was committed to the flames. Twice at Rome he ignominiously recanted; afterward, when the fear of death was removed, he returned to his former teaching. He seemed animated with an opposition equal to everything but martyrdom. The dogma of transubstantiation, however, spread, pervading the Church, until, in the Sixteenth Century, it received its final authoritative statement in the Canon of the Council of Trent, declaring,—

“Whosoever shall deny that, in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really and substantially contained the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with His soul and Divinity, and, consequently, Christ entire, but shall affirm that He is present, only in sign and figure, or, by His power, let him be accursed.”

The philosophy of the change, concerning the Holy Eucharist, can be easily traced. Our Lord had promised to be with His disciples after His Ascension, both by Himself and by the Holy Spirit. The very words of institution seemed to indicate a peculiar Presence. If the followers of our Lord were to be made one with Him by Faith, how much more in this Sacramental Act? The elements were to be received in remembrance of that Body which was the temple of His Divinity—which they had seen, in repeated miracles, an instrument of Omnipotence—which they had beheld on the Cross amid the convulsions of a universe—which they had gazed upon, as it passed through the cloud into Heaven—which derived, from Deity, the merit of its passion, and the glory of its exaltation. These feelings of awe and amazement, awakened and perpetuated by the Holy Communion, intensi-



fied to a degree, which, at this distance of ages, we can scarcely conceive, impressed themselves on the hearts, and discourses, and writings, of the primitive teachers in such a way, that modern conceptions seem tame and cold, compared with their burning and impassioned utterances in regard to a PRESENT SAVIOUR. As the world receded from the light of simplicity and truth, conceptions more and more sensuous obtained. The bread and wine had their substance really changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, and, by a species of mystical charm, became the sustenance of immortality. Men, desirous of increasing their gains and promoting their authority, were willing to have themselves esteemed agents of Omnipotence in a miracle so stupendous, until what was a Sacrament of Life degenerated into a wretched superstition.

At the Reformation, different tendencies manifested themselves. Luther's persistent opposition to the Zwinglian view, is universally known. His doctrine received its formal expression in the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession, which teaches, "That the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present in the Sacrament in the form of bread and wine, and there distributed and received." In antagonism to his view, and representing the opinions of the distinctive Calvinists generally, are the statements of the Westminster Confession, where the elements of the Holy Communion are chiefly regarded as mere memorials of a dying Saviour. The writers, adhering to religious organizations adopting that Confession, seem wholly to ignore all conceptions of Presence in the Eucharist, and to consider it a Confession of Faith on the part of the believer, a renewal of his covenant, a pledge of his devotion, a bond of his fellowship, a memento of an atoning Lord.

The Divines of the Church of England, at the period of the Reformation, by the excited struggles of the Continent, had constantly before them the opposing views of Luther and Zwingli, and between these many oscillated, until, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, true to those instincts, which a ways, sooner or later, conducted into the safe path, avoiding, on the one hand, the superstitions of Rome, and, on the other, the violence

of the Continental Reformation, the CHURCH, in Her Articles and Her Communion Office, has preserved all that was true in the different systems, retaining, in the language of the Scriptures, the ancient Liturgies, and the Fathers, the ideas both of Memorial and Presence, simply taking for granted the fact, without expressing the mode.

If Arch-Bishop Cranmer afterwards inclined to the opinion of Zwingle, yet, in his work on the Lord's Supper, he could say, "For this Sacramental bread and wine be no bare and naked figures, but so pithy and effectuous, that whosoever worthily eateth them, eateth spiritually Christ's Flesh and Blood, and hath Everlasting Life; wherefore, whosoever cometh to the Lord's Table, with all humility, fear, reverence and purity of life, does not receive only bread and wine, but, also, our Saviour, Christ, both God and Man, with all his benefits to the relief and sustentation both of their bodies and souls." "This, therefore, is the sum of my teaching in this fourth book, that in the true ministration of the Sacrament, Christ is *present spiritually*, and so spiritually eaten of them that be godly and spiritual."

Even Bishop Jewel, in his controversy with M. Harding, occasionally uses the strongest language, indicating Christ's Presence. "He knows well," he writes, "we feed not the people with bare signs and figures, but teach them that the Sacraments of Christ be Holy Mysteries, and that, in the ministration thereof, Christ is set before us as He was crucified upon the Cross. Herein, we teach the people, that not a naked sign and token, but that Christ's Body and Blood, indeed, are verily given to us—that we verily eat it, that we verily drink it, that we verily be relieved and live by it; that we are bone of His bones, and flesh of His Flesh; that Christ dwelleth in us, and we in Him."

When Hooker says, "The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not, therefore, to be sought in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receivers of the Sacrament;" we understand him as only denying that *corporal* presence of the Romanists, which he combats. He afterwards affirms, "Life

being, therefore, proposed to all men as an end, they who, by Baptism, have laid the foundation, and attained the first beginning of a new Life, have their nourishment and food prescribed for continuance of Life in them—such as will have the Life of the Son of God, must eat the Flesh of the Son of Man—whereas in infancy we are incorporated into Christ, and, by Baptism, receive the grace of his Holy Spirit.”

Jeremy Taylor, in his own forcible, original and inimitable way, professes to express the whole teaching of the Liturgy, Articles and Divines of the Church of England, where he says, “After the Minister of Holy Mysteries hath rightly prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and wine, the symbols become changed into the Body and Blood of Christ after a *Sacramental*, that is, in a real and spiritual manner, so that all, who worthily communicate, do by Faith receive Christ really, effectually to all the purposes of Christ’s passion. It is bread, and it is Christ’s Body. It is bread in substance—it is *Christ in the Sacrament*, and Christ is really given to all that are truly disposed as the symbols are—each as they can—Christ as Christ can be given—Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul as the elements do the body.” He asserts, “That this is the doctrine of the Church of England, is apparent in the Church Catechism affirming the inward part, or thing signified by the consecrated bread and wine, to be the Body and Blood of Christ, which are really and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper, and the benefit to be the ‘strengthening and refreshing of the soul by the Body and Blood of Christ as our bodies are by bread and wine,’ and the same is severally repeated in the exhortation, and in the prayer of the Address before the Consecration in the Canon of our Communion. Now that the spiritual is also a *real* presence, and they are hugely consistent, is easily credible to them that believe the gifts of the Holy Ghost are real graces.”

Now I think it is obvious, from these quotations from our Communion Office, that the Church represents Christ in the Holy Eucharist as the adherents of the Westminster Confession seldom, or never do, while She, at the same time, avoids the Romish doctrine of a corporal presence, by stating, in her

XXVIIIth Article, that transubstantiation "is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." There is, indeed, a true, safe and beautiful view, which She inculcates in choice, inimitable words, selected principally from the Sacred Oracles, and which are reverently received without any explanations by the most of her children. Still, as in her article on Predestination, and in many parts of her Ritual, there is a latitude allowable to the individualities of men, within which, her members may be satisfied and loyal. One, missing her admirable mean, may make more prominent to his consciousness expressions preserving the Zwinglian view of the Sacrament as a Memorial; another may be impressed with the notion of Presence, while a third unites *both* in their intended harmony. Here is afforded an admirable occasion for the exercise of that charity, "which is the bond of perfectness."

Having thus traced the history of opinions in regard to the Holy Communion, from an early period, and exhibited the teaching of the Church on this branch of our subject, we are prepared to approach the consideration of the Declaration. Dr. Pusey, having first denied the Romish dogma of transubstantiation, affirms, that the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are present, "really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably." There may be here objections to the form of the statement, but not to its orthodoxy. The learned Divine at once separates himself by an impassable chasm from Rome, and exposes himself to all the anathemas of Trent. He strikes at Papal infallibility. His declaration would be spurned at the Vatican. He undertakes to express the presence of our Lord's Body and Blood as spiritual, in opposition to corporal. His explanation fails, as that of all others, in bringing before the mind any distinct notion of what, as an admitted mystery, is incapable of illustration. It seems far better to reverently follow the simple language of the Prayer Book in childlike Faith and Love. It is bread, and yet the Body of Christ. It is wine, and yet the Blood of Christ. We eat; we drink; we are nourished for body and soul into Everlasting Life. The fact is

asserted; the benefit is realized; the mode remains a mystery. Yet, while the statement of Dr. Pusey, like everything of a similar nature, may be imperfect in the attempt, it is not more objectionable than that of Ratramnus, the champion of truth against transubstantiation as now inculcated by Rome, and who taught, that the Eternal Word, by the Consecration, unites Himself to the elements, and is received by the believer. It is, also, interesting to note how almost exactly the Divine of Oxford agrees with the expressions of the Bishop of Down, who glowed with a fire of zeal against Romish corruptions. Taylor, so distinguished at once for genius, learning and orthodoxy, avers, that the symbols "become changed into the Body and Blood of Christ after a Sacramental, that is, after a real and spiritual manner." Dr. Pusey asserts, that the "Body and Blood of Christ are present really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably." An enemy here could scarce trace a difference. It is a matter of marvel that all Christians, who have supposed Dr. Pusey, on this vital point, almost in sympathy with Rome, would not hail with joy opinions so eternally antagonistic to the mediæval superstitions of the Papacy, instead of still covering one, whose character is certainly beautified by many graces, with a cloud of obloquy. Let us hope, that in advocating a view somewhat extreme and objectionable in its form of statement, he is an instrument in leading the Church back from a low, loose and irreverent Zwinglian tendency in regard to the Holy Communion, to that love and reverence which characterized the primitive Christians, when they partook the Body and Blood of their crucified and ascended Lord.

But whether we should carry ourselves to the length of Eucharistic adoration, is quite another question. The Declaration, indeed, repudiates all worship of the Sacramental bread and wine as idolatry, and affirms that only Christ Himself, "really and truly, but spiritually and ineffably" present in the Sacrament, must be adored. This, indeed, avoids the imputation of a Romish reverence; nor do we fear that the Church can ever be conducted back from the light of this age to the darkness of Mediæval superstition. Such apprehensions usually begin in weakness, and end in cant. Still, we must remember that our

Church, in one of her Articles, has spoken in a way which seems impliedly designed to guard against this very tendency to Eucharistic adoration. She affirms, "The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about." After all Dr. Pusey's distinctions and explanations, and although a seemingly logical inference from his premises, we are not persuaded to the practice he advocates. Besides, the prejudice and misapprehensions it excites, with the possible injury to the weak and ignorant, are certainly considerations which the wisdom of charity should not overlook. There is, however, a propriety during certain portions of our service, in turning reverently, as the Prayer Book authorizes, towards the place where the holy symbols of our Lord are consecrated, so that we may appear to contemplate and address, not man, but God. Thus, Daniel, without imputation of idolatry, knelt at his open window towards Jerusalem, which, then a ruin, had been the place, where over the mercy seat in the holiest of the temple, rested the cloud of the Presence of Jehovah. If, with the face thus directed to the place where the symbols of our Lord's Body and Blood have been consecrated, any believer reverently adores his Redeemer as specially and mysteriously manifested, however we regard the act, we certainly cannot blame the intention.

We have considered the third part of the Declaration out of the order in which it appeared, because it came more naturally in the course of our remarks. There remains that clause relating to the notion of sacrifice in the Holy Communion. The Trentine dogma is emphatically repudiated. All notion of fresh sacrifice is denied. Nothing, it is asserted, is added to the all-sufficient "oblation" of the Cross, which is pronounced "that perfect Redemption, Propitiation and Satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, original and actual." This only is meritorious. Certainly this statement, thus clearly and publicly made, should remove the opinion, entertained by thousands, that Dr. Pusey holds the Romish opinion of sacrifice. As we understand the Declaration, it avers, that, as Christ, the Great High Priest, offers Himself before the Eternal Father, pleading by His Presence the Sacrifice of Himself once offered on the Cross, so on earth, in the Holy

Eucharist, that same Body once, for all sacrificed for us, that same Blood, once for all shed for us, *sacramentally* present, are offered and pleaded before the Father by the Priest.

As we apprehend the Communion Office, there is contemplated a four-fold sacrifice. The Priest, having placed on the Table the bread and wine, praying for the "whole state of Christ's Church militant," offers first to God, "the alms and oblations" of the people, as expressions of their charity and obedience. He here stands as a representative on earth in supplication to Heaven. Again, he presents the "Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving," rendering to the Eternal Father, in behalf of His children, their admiration for the "Majesty of His Glory," and their gratitude for the bounty of His Goodness. He also, in the third place, says, "we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee," thus giving to God, its Creator and Redeemer, the whole being, freighted with its interests for Time and for Eternity. Lastly, because most important, we consider the act of the Priest, who, identifying himself with the people, as their representative and advocate, exclaims: "We, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy HOLY GIFTS, which we now offer unto Thee, the Memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make, having in remembrance His blessed passion and precious death, His mighty resurrection and glorious Ascension." Here, it may be remarked, we have the collected Faith, and Love, and Wisdom of the Church during ages, taken from Her most ancient Liturgies, and purified from all Mediæval additions, until there is expressed for all time the truest Christian consciousness. The Priest below, presents in behalf of the people, the bread and wine, in sympathy with the High Priest above, mediating before the Father with His own Body and Blood once for all offered on the Cross as a sacrifice for the world.

Now, let it be observed, the difference is slight between this simple and received explanation of the Communion Office, and the language of the Declaration. In the one case, the Priest is represented as "offering these Thy Holy Gifts," alluding to



the bread and wine, and in the other case, the Body and Blood of Christ, adopting the language of Bishop Taylor, "*sacramentally*" present. In the one case, he presents the symbol ; in the other case, he is declared to present the thing supposed to be symbolized, not there really and corporally, as in the view of Rome, but only "spiritually and ineffably," in the language of Dr. Pusey. We much prefer the simple words of the Communion Office, but can perceive no very alarming error in the expressions of the Declaration.

And here, it may be said, with the opinions of Dr. Pusey not contained in the Declaration we have now no concern. We have heard him, from childhood, branded as an errorist. A clergyman of the Church recently suggested that he was a disguised Jesuit. We confess to a thrill of pleasure, when the perusal of his Declaration rendered it admissible to account for his beautiful Christian character by a demonstrable orthodoxy. Perhaps, if his most censured views of baptismal regeneration, and his supposed denial of salvation by faith, were examined without prejudice, it might be found that he differed from the standards of the Church, rather in statement than reality. Could the Bishop of Ohio, and the Professor of Oxford, both equally venerable for their godliness, understand each other in the use of terms, they might join hands, and, kneeling before their Redeemer, ascribe to Him all the glory of their salvation. Dr. Pusey's advocacy of Tract number Ninety, seems more startling and inexplicable. The dreams of his Eirenicon are simply amusing and amazing. The great scholar, in his classic retreat, exposing himself by his Declaration to the anathemas of Trent, or exhibiting with unprecedented clearness the prostitution of Rome in the worship of the Virgin, yet believes, that the Vatican will seal its thunders ; and, by a union with the Church of England, reformed in the fires of martyrdom, the Pope will abandon the very foundations of his throne. An imagination so harmless might excite a smile, but certainly should never arouse a tempest.

Perhaps, in conclusion, it may not be amiss to consider the state of parties in the Church, so nearly connected with the important movement, which, if not originated by Dr. Pusey, has, at least, been under his guidance.

The Church in England and in America, combines two elements,—a true ORDER, and a true FAITH. On the side of Order, she stands in sympathy with the Greek, and with the Romish Church. On the side of Faith, she harmonizes, substantially, with those Orthodox denominations, which sprang out of the Reformation. Laying Her maternal hand on both, She would unite them in her Fold, and in the millennial, as in the primitive, time, be, throughout the world, the one HOLY, CATHOLIC, and APOSTOLIC CHURCH. In such a position, resulting from her genius, and her history, we might anticipate a preponderating element of conservatism, with, on either side, rash and injurious extremes. Such exist in fact. We see two classes, differing in temperament, opinion, and conduct. Nor is it desirable that all varieties of character should be destroyed by a resistless rigidity. If men are loyal to the Church, if they love her with a filial affection, if they submit to her authority, if they observe her rubrics, if they obey her Canons, they may, within certain limits, vary in their views of Predestination, Justification, Baptism, the Eucharist, Orders, and many other subjects. But the difficulty is, prudence is too often disregarded, and charity is too often grieved. Hence the classes I have named rush into strife, perhaps into Schism. Here, on the one hand, are men of taste, of sensibility, of reverence. They admire the past. They love unity. They venerate authority. They cultivate art. Painting, Sculpture, Poetry, Architecture, Music, possess for them an ineffable charm. The gorgeous pageantries of Rome, during Holy Week, appealing to their sensibilities, would lift them into a Heaven of adoring admiration. They are remarkable, more for fancy than logic, and enjoy the glow of refined emotion more than the truth of severe doctrine. They perceive, in the candle on the altar, an image of Christ as the light of the world. They see, in the smoke of the censer, a type of gratitude arising from a Christian heart. Overlooking the prejudice excited by every practice, however pure, if seemingly Romish, and often disregarding the feelings of brethren, they never understand how it may not be wrong to lavish ornament on a window, and yet wrong to decorate a vestment. They

persistently refuse to concede, that it is not sinful to make the sign of the Cross on the forehead, and yet sinful to wear the sign of the Cross on a Chasuble. They find it hard to comprehend, how it is not censurable to attract to the Church by pulpit eccentricities, and yet censurable to attract by a rich ritual. While a few of these persons may be in secret sympathy with Rome, others give evidence of love to Christ, and activity for his poor. We do not incline to their modes, and would not like to see them prevail. Yet we deem they will be more easily cured by toleration than by thunder. The *Directorium Anglicanum* will perish, like a building which falls because the weight of its ornaments exceeds the strength of its foundations. But while these may be individual opinions, there are other, and more serious questions. What is the *LAW* regulating the practices of Ritualism? Are they allowable according to the Canons and Rubrics of the Church? How far does the Ecclesiastical legislation of England apply to America? Are we to be bound by the Prayer Books of Edward, and the enactments of Parliament? Or, as in the case of our national Constitution, should we look to the Mother Country, not for rules of authority, but principles of interpretation? Here we embark on a sea of difficulties. Unable to determine these questions, we have seen one Bishop excusably hesitate to interfere with strange practices in his jurisdiction, while a majority of his associates felt themselves conscientiously compelled into a Declaration, which seemed to interfere with the regulation of a Diocese beyond their legal control. Where is the remedy for such an anomalous condition of affairs? When we consider the questions which have arisen in relation to the Nicene Creed, to the Provincial System, to inter-Communion with other Churches, to Ritual, and to various subjects of agitation, does it not seem a call of God, by his wise Providences, to our General Convention, to appoint a Commission, who shall consider not one, but *all* important points of difficulty, and by authoritative and unmistakable *LAW*, compose the Church? Until this be done, there seems no end of strife, unless novelties expend themselves by their own violence.

But we now approach another, and an opposite class. Here we have men with little natural reverence,—often impulsive and eccentric. They are in the Church by birth, or accident. They do not incline to the æsthetic. They love doctrine more than art. In habits, in manners, in tendency, they are Puritanic,—more free among strangers than in their own household. To them, symbolism is odious. Every addition to Ritual, is an advance toward Rome. Altar lights are kindled from the sparks of the pit. Incense is a smoke from the nostrils of the Beast. A splendid vestment is a Popish abomination. These men, usually correct in Faith, often godly in life, and abundant in labor, find themselves repelled by whatever even distantly resembles Rome, and attracted, through their emotional experiences, and doctrinal affinities, to the surrounding denominations. Nor would this be culpable, if they simply indulged preferences as individuals. But, as in the other case, there arise questions of duty, and submission, and law, which, passing beyond the single person, affect the entire Church. Here, however, the questions are unembarrassed with doubt. If anything is settled in the Church, it is the doctrine of Orders, which lies at the foundation of her entire Ecclesiastical System. We believe it drawn from Scripture, established by the Apostles, and transmitted through ages. It is expressed in the Preface to our Ordination Office. It is witnessed by the Canons, and the practice of the Church in England and America, restricting our pulpits to Clergymen Episcopally ordained. It is demonstrated by the hand of every Bishop, placed on ministers who have come from the various religious organizations. It has been made dear to the hearts of thousands by immemorial usage, and the venerable example of godly Clergymen. Now, merely to shock the sensibilities made sacred under such circumstances, is no slight offence. Simply to disturb the peace of fellowship, is a more censurable fault. But to defiantly proclaim that the *repeal of the Law is to be secured by its violation*, is rebellion against the Church, and injury to the State, spreading everywhere the infectious evil of war against constituted authority. In such a case, nothing remains but to summon, to arraign, to try, to convict, to pun-

ish the culprit. Without this, neither God nor man can be satisfied. Yet, in dealing with these extremes, let the aim be, not excision, but correction. The Law should be executed with firmness, but in love.

Nor should the existence of these extremes excite distrust as to the mission of the Church. Nay, these opposite parties may have their strifes overruled by Infinite Wisdom for her final triumph, and prove Providential links, on the one hand uniting us with the Oriental and with the Western Church, and on the other, with the innumerable denominations ; and so far from causes of alarm, are proofs of Catholicity. Let the Reformed Church, at once resting on the true FAITH, and the true ORDER, as the foundation laid by the Saviour and by the Apostles, keep ever burning on her altars the fires of love, and, in the latter days of earth's glory, she shall arise, with Her Primitive Constitution, and Her Millennial Purity, to shine in the brightness of Her Lord, and extend her sway of peace over our world.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

**THE HUGUENOTS, THEIR SETTLEMENTS, CHURCHES AND INDUSTRIES IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND.** By SAMUEL SMILES, author of "Self Help," "Lives of the Engineers, etc.," with an Appendix relating to the Huguenots in America. 12mo., pp. 448. Harper & Brothers. 1868.

The history of the Huguenots possesses a tragic interest. There are few pages more deeply stained than those which record the dragonnades, the butcherings, the burnings, the imprisonments, the exiles, consequent on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The infatuation, producing such scenes of horror and blood, is more wonderful, when, amid the congratulations of the Pope, the joy of Bishops, the exultation of Kings, and the shouts of the populace, we hear the eloquence of a Bossuet and a Massillon, applauding the zeal which drove from their desolate homes many of the best and noblest families in France. If, in the work of Mr. Smiles, events so thrilling, and tragic, are not depicted with the greatest dramatic power, the narrative at least is always clear, sustained, and truthful, while the frequent introduction of personal adventure excites the interest and deepens the impression of the reader. It is instructive to remark, how the cruelties of France were punished by the loss of some of her most gifted sons, and the prostration, or rather extinction, of many profitable branches of industry. England, on the other hand, was amply rewarded for her generous sympathies and contributions, to which she is to day owing much of her present manufacturing and commercial greatness. While humble mechanics were industriously plying new trades, soldiers, scholars, and divines were enrolled among the most illustrious names of Britain. Even the Queen of England has Huguenot blood in her veins. The present Archbishop of Dublin, is said to be of Huguenot descent. Dukes, Earls, and Barons, are connected with the Huguenots. Sir Samuel Romilly, Dr. Porter, Grote the historian, are of Huguenot origin. In our own country, Huguenot families have left their traces in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, where they have increased the wealth, and fought the battles of the Republic. The brilliant Laurens, the illustrious Jay, the celebrated Boudinot, were of Huguenot extraction.

The work of Mr. Smiles, with the Appendix by the Hon. G. P. Dissosway, exhibits the history of the Huguenots, both of England and America, most satisfactorily, evincing scholarly research and a mastery of the subject. We commend the book as entertaining, and permanently valuable.

**THE HERMITAGE, AND OTHER POEMS.** By EDWARD ROWLAND SILL. 12mo., 152 pp. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1868.

Nothing is more difficult, than to form an opinion of poetic merit. What finds no response in the colder heart of the critic, may yet touch the sympathies of thousands. There is a subtle charm in poetry, which, like the fragrance of flowers, is too often chilled away before the icy breath of the formal reviewer. Besides, after the toil of years, with all the alternations of hope, and despair, how cruel, by a remorseless inquisition, to crush a young aspirant to poetic honors, and turn to darkness the bright expectations of friends and admirers! While these thoughts have been suggested in reading the book of Mr. Sill, we have neither the intention, or the occasion, of any such murderous violence. Here are displayed a most respectable culture, many tokens of creative power, certain delicacies of perception and felicities of expression, frequent excellence of versification, and more than ordinary promise of future success. Mr. Sill's poem, will be read with pleasure by many, and with respect by all. Yet it may be a fair question, whether

the same talent and industry, devoted to other departments of intellectual labor, would not bring more happiness to himself, and profit to others. Our world is filled with verses and pictures, but not with poets and artists. While we should regret to see Mr. Sill expend the whole energies of his superior mind, in turning to verse the visions of his fancy, yet, if he regards poetry as a secondary consideration,—if he makes it the ornament, rather than the foundation of his life,—if, while cultivating the flowers, he also gathers its fruits of some practical vocation, although his genius may not permanently enrich literature, it will diffuse grace, and beauty over his career.

THE GUARDIAN ANGEL. By OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, Author, &c. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867. 12mo., pp. 420.

Somebody says, that the "Guardian Angel" is a novel without a story. It is not, however, without a design. It is little more than a repetition of "Elsie Venner,"—characters, illustrations, and incidents are all new, while the purpose is the same. The author belongs to a class of men, possessed with a spirit of hostility to the Scriptural account of the natural character of man, as given in the Historical Books of Moses. Sometimes they use Chronology, sometimes Geology, sometimes Philology, sometimes Physiology, as a weapon of attack. Sometimes they combine to prove, that humanity has suffered no such lapse as the Scriptures teach, by practical illustrations of new forms of "Social Life," and so we have such exhibitions as the "Brook Farm" experiment. But all such enterprises have collapsed, while their projectors have not always collapsed with them. They are still persistent in keeping before the public. Oliver Wendell Holmes' "rattlesnake bite," which was the key note to "Elsie Venner," was so grossly offensive on the score of good taste, that he has now essayed to teach the same general sentiments by a novel, having at least the semblance of every day life. His object is to show, that the development of inherited character "happens, but less obviously to common observation, in the *mental* and *moral* nature." The rigid Calvinism, in which the author was educated, seems to have had an effect on him, similar to that produced by Mediæval Romanism on Voltaire and Renan. We regret that he has been driven by distorted perversions of the Divine character, to such utter, and cold, and heartless infidelity.

VISIONS OF PARADISE, AN EPIC. By DAVID N. LORD. New York; David N. Lord. 1867. 12mo., pp. 415.

The pretentious title of a book always provokes criticism. Perhaps no author should affix to his own production the name, Epic. That Poem to which this word properly applies, is considered the grandest creation of human genius, involves plot, incident, character, and implies a delicacy, a grasp, a fire of soul, allotted to few men and few ages. The author of "Visions of Paradise," has miscalled his Poem. It is properly a series of descriptions by one, who, we should suppose, had been an attentive reader of Dante, Milton, and Pollock. Much sound theology is inculcated. There are many pious sentiments. Every where are indications of a pure and affectionate heart. Occasionally there are striking expressions. The metre is respectable. The Poem might kindle a glow of pleasure in the particular circle of the author, for the sanctities and sympathies of which it is far better suited than for the censorious gaze of the public. But there are wanting that creative power, accompanied by the inexpressible sweetness of rhythm and majesty of thought, essential to the Epic. We doubt not that a grand American Poem, on a similar theme, will yet be written,—having neither the painful detail of Dante, or the laborious loftiness of Milton,—bringing the sublime truths of our holy religion more in sympathy with ordinary minds, and into the range of common life—connecting Time and Eternity by the Cross in a way less marked by the "palpably obscure."

JOSEPH II. AND HIS COURT. An Historical Novel. By L. MÜHLBACH. Author of Frederick the Great, and his Court, &c., translated from the German, by Adelaide De V. Chaudron. D. Appleton & Co.: New York. 1867. 8vo., pp. 343.



We select this book for notice, at this late period, as one of the best produced by Miss Mühlbach, and a type of what she has published in the past, and will probably write in the future. We do not wonder at its popularity. We are at once introduced to the splendor of Courts, and the intrigues of Cabinets. We are clearly shown that every human interest may be stirred by the lives of monarchs and statesmen, and that to move the heart it is not wholly necessary to draw incident and character from dens of vice and infamy. The master genius of the world, in delineation of man, found in *Courts* his Hamlet and his Lear, and Miss Mühlbach's astonishing success proves her right in not following some modern theories on this subject. Besides, she has used the facts of history in a way both instructive and entertaining. This particular work exhibits everywhere extraordinary genius. There are single scenes wrought up with high dramatic power, and where the interest is excited to a thrilling intensity. We mention, for instance, Joseph's visit to the dim vaults, containing those haughty monarchs of Hapsburg, who for ages have swayed the sceptre over Austria. There are descriptions, too, of natural scenery, for freshness and beauty rarely surpassed. The sagacity and comprehensiveness of Kaunitz, his skepticism, his arrogance, his luxuriousness, his whims, are admirably contrasted with the really noble, imperious, and ambitious Maria Theresa, while two natures so opposite are most skillfully harmonized into a strange fellowship, and become coöperative by the unity of a common purpose,—the glory of Austria. Most strikingly contrasted with his mother, and her minister, appears Joseph,—weak not from nature, but from circumstances—the victim of royal birth—ever fighting against his destiny, at last sinking under its hard appointments,—his conscious ability crushed before the mature energies of the empress—an eagle pining for the freedom of the mountain, and the brilliance of the sun, yet slowly dying under the doom of confinement to a gilded cage.

However, with all these admirable touches of genius, the book has glaring defects. There is absolutely no plot,—no convergence of events to a great catastrophe,—none of that unity of design, marking the novels of the "Wizard of the North," where the soul is hurried along with eager interest to the unfolding of the magical narration. The writer seems desirous to crowd into her book, every prominent event, and every important character, in an entire age, with the slightest possible regard to their connection, until her work resembles a gallery hung promiscuously with all the brilliant pictures of a half century. There is still a graver fault. The revels of Kaunitz bring to view a revolting lasciviousness, and indeed the voluptuousness underlying his strong character is most corrupting to the young. The interview between Catharine and her lovers, is equally shocking to taste and decency. There is indeed pervading the volume a subtle spirit of infection, to be felt rather than expressed, from which true delicacy shrinks, and which we fear arises from a secret skepticism of the writer, like exhalations from a hidden marsh.

It is urged, that the representations alluded to are in simple accordance with facts. True. But what the brevity of history records in a few words, leaves no impression of impurity; whereas, depicted in the detail of the novelist, the same events become loathsome and intolerable. Besides, Miss Mühlbach's German earnestness, unrelieved by that delicate play of wit and humor, with which genius so often relieves tragic horrors, imparts a species of grotesque hideousness to her delineations of sensuality and passion. The volume reminds us of a tree, whose bright blossoms load the air with the most delightful odors, while there distill from its trunk sweet drops of intoxicating poison.

NATHAN THE WISE. A Dramatic Poem. By GOTTHOLD EPHRAIM LESSING. Translated by Ellen Frothingham. pp. 259. 12mo. Leypoldt & Holt, New York, 1868.

Longfellow performed great service for literature, by introducing to this continent, in his "Poets and Poetry of Europe," many productions of the highest genius, before almost unknown to American readers. Now, however, instead of fragmentary selections, entire works are demanded. Specimens from the noble works of Scandinavian and German mind are not sufficient,—the mines themselves

must lay bare their treasures to our gaze. We foresee plainly, that the taste which has been heretofore formed, and cultivated, will be insatiable in its demands, until our country is deluged with the Poetry of Sweden, and Denmark, and Russia, and Germany, as it has been with certain systems of Philosophy, and it is not improbable that the enterprising publishers of "NATHAN THE WISE," will engage largely in the work they have begun. Dangerous and insidious as may be the skepticism often introduced, and while many may be injured, we have great confidence in the healthful ruggedness of American mind. Although we would do nothing to obscure from our land the beams of true genius, it is a duty to point out the spots upon its disk. The interests of our youth demand that they shall be furnished with the rich treasures of the European Muse, and at the same time be guarded against what might prove a fatal fascination. But to our book. Lessing was unquestionably a large hearted man, of rare intellectual powers. He strangely united two arts, seemingly antagonistic. He was both a poet and a critic. While his dramas have left their impression on the popular mind, his prose compositions have greatly influenced Literature and Philosophy. He was the advocate, almost the originator, of that most pernicious maxim,—"Well doing is the main thing,—belief is secondary,"—thus taking for granted, that faith and conduct are separable. The effect of this principle on his own morals is seen in the sketch of his life, appended to the Poem. It is there said,—“He gambled a great deal harder than present ideas approve,” affirming “the eager attention he gave to the Faro table,” set the clogged machine in motion, “brought the stagnant juices into circulation.” Goethe, speaking of a certain period of his career, remarks, “that he led a dissipated life in taverns and society, since he needed constantly a strong counterpoise to his powerfully laborious soul.” “Nathan the Wise” was most probably written to illustrate, in the Dramatic form, the plausible error we have mentioned. There appear every where in it, traces of a noble genius and a manly soul. The interested attachment of Daja, the purity, and affection of Recha, the villainous selfishness of the Patriarch, the impulsive heroism of the Templar, the artful love of Sittah, the inconsiderate generosity of Saladin, and the meek, thoughtful, beautiful wisdom of Nathan, are in charming contrast; each, like the parts of a picture, adding to the attractiveness of the other. While there is no exuberance of fancy, and no high dramatic power, there are always pleasing and instructive thoughts, in correct and flowing verse, with many scenes exceedingly touching and interesting. Yet, beneath all these charms of genius, there seems to lurk a secret hostility to Christianity, while there is nothing which greatly depreciates Judaism, or Mohammedism. The flings are at the former, and not the latter. After all that has been urged, by way of explanation and apology, it is difficult to suppose there was no design in the arrangement, which makes the selfish Daja, and the weak Lay brother, and the rascally Patriarch, Christians, while the noble Sultan and his devoted Sister are followers of the Prophet. Recha, a Christian by birth, owes her excellence to a Jewish education. Her brother, the Templar, chafes under the restraints of his order, and is no friend to the Religion imposing them. Nathan, who exhibits none of the faults, and all the excellences of the other characters, and is presented as a model of wisdom and love, is a Jew. We do not believe these peculiarities were made necessary by the demands of Art, or the facts of history. They sprang, we fear, from a mind and heart, unconsciously perhaps, at war with Christianity. Yet, if granted the liberty of pointing out both the defects and merits of such productions of genius, we would no more withhold them from our youth than we would the poems of Homer or Horace.

Let us add, that the translation, in point of perspicuity, and the melody and correctness of the versification, deserves high praise.

QUEENS OF AMERICAN SOCIETY. By Mrs. ELLET, author “Of the Women of the American Revolution,” “Women Artists, &c.” New York. Charles Scribner & Co. 8vo, pp. 464.

This is really a pleasing Book, which only a woman could write. If it is interesting to know the costume of an ancient Greek Lady, or to understand the arrangements of a Roman dwelling, or to revive the picture of Puritan or Cavalier, we cannot see why we should not be attracted by information in regard to the cues, and knee-buckles, and breakfasts, and dinners, and dancings, and, generally, the dress,

manners, and habits of our Republican ancestors. Many incidents of family history are here gracefully preserved, which would otherwise soon have faded even from household tradition. Such collections of minute, and, to some apprehensions, trivial facts, exert a powerful, but unconscious influence on history itself, and at some distant day may, perhaps, afford material for the reflections of the Philosopher. We are thankful for the industry, which gathers and arranges these incidents in pleasing style, and hope the pictures of the dignified courtliness of our ancestors may have some effect in restraining and refining the manners of their children. Whether the matrons of America should be styled "*Queens*," or the expression "*Republican Court*" should be employed, are questions of taste which will be differently determined,—but however settled, the pleasing interest of the volume remains. We would also add, that the descriptions of the beauty, elegance, and worth of the departed, have been to us more agreeable than the praises of the living. The latter may give rise to the charge of excessive and interested laudation, and, by placing womanly loveliness too glaringly before the public eye, will excite either the blush of modesty, or the smile of gratified vanity.

SELECTIONS FROM THE KALEVALA, translated from the German version, by JOHN A. PORTER, M.D., late Professor in Yale College, with an introduction, and analysis of the Poem. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 1868. 12mo, 148 pp.

The Finnish Mythology was dispersed in Songs, until 1822, Dr. Topelius made a collection of Poems, which perhaps suggested the singular, and almost mythical, enterprise of Dr. Elias Lönnrot. He, during years, wandered among the peasants, venturing even to the snows of Archangel, near the frozen shores of the White Sea, and collecting the treasures of the past from living lips. The result of these enthusiastic and wonderful labors, was the KALEVALA, published in 1835. That a Poem, gathered in this fragmentary way, should exhibit unity in its plan, is most remarkable; nor does there seem any reason to suspect imposture, as in the case of Macpherson's Ossian. Still, we are not to be driven, by this fact, nor by the other arguments of the day, from our boyish conviction that *one* soul breathes fire into the Iliad, and fills it with all images of beauty and of majesty. While we do not think it wise to institute a comparison between the Epics of Greece, and of Finland, we recognize in the KALEVALA the invention of Genius; and love to transport ourselves amid the rough scenes of the North, and the simple beings of the past, and feel the charm of a certain inexpressible humor, and grotesque sublimity peculiar to the early literature of those European polar regions, where the silence and prolonged twilight seem to invest nature with a species of spectral gloom, most favorable to the play of the imagination. We rejoice to see the literary creations of all ages and nations thus brought into our country, to stimulate and expand the American mind.

SALOME, A DRAMATIC POEM. By J. C. HEYWOOD. New York, 1867. Hurd & Houghton. 12mo, 222 pp.

We have always supposed that the Christian Religion was capable of being interwoven with every species of Literature and of Art. We hail with pleasure each intimation of a day, when it will pervade and inspire even Fiction and the Drama. We expect nothing less than that there will be millennial genius corresponding to millennial glory. It is therefore, with every prepossession in its favor, that we commence a notice of a volume, where the old Greek chorus is made to express Christian ideas, in such a way that the attempt is not a ludicrous failure. The plot of SALOME has unity: the interest is well sustained; the characters are consistently and sometimes strikingly developed; and the imagery is frequently impressive. History has also been used to advantage. The mind is affected by the descriptions of the Poet, very much as it is by the narrations of the Historian. Vengeance, Discord, Pestilence, Famine, War, hang like phantoms over the doomed city, scattering horrors, while the sweet and gentle Christian virtues—Faith, and Patience, and Love, diffuse their mild influences over Life and Death, amid the tumults of battle, and under the clouds of wrath. There is, however,

in the Poem, a verbosity,—a want of concentration in thought and language, which greatly detract from its power. The measure is not always correct. There is often a noticeable deficiency in the melody of the verse—sometimes even a roughness is apparent. We cannot admire the wit, or the love-scenes of the Drama; they seem constrained and labored. Yet, notwithstanding these blemishes, we believe “*SALOME*” exhibits a fertility of invention, a strength of imagination, and a power of expression, deserving high commendation, and full of future promise.

**HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF GOD.** By G. C. JONES, D. D. The Old Testament Dispensation. New York, 1867. Charles Scribner & Co. 1st vol., 8vo. 558 pp.

This Book exhibits that careful culture, that moderation of statement, and yet those decided views, which we should expect from a Professor in a Presbyterian Theological Seminary. It is really nothing but an arrangement of events recorded in the Bible, in a certain order, with a discursion, wherever suggested, or possible, into the regions of Calvinistic Divinity. The Introduction announces that we must appeal alone to the Scriptures for any authorized form of Church Government, thus at once depriving us of those unquestionable arguments, all equally strong, for our present Sabbath observance, for infant Baptism, and the Apostolic Constitution of the ONE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, perpetuated through the Episcopacy. We have, afterwards, the old Calvinistic view of the Covenant of Works between the Creator and Adam, and the Covenant of grace between the Father and the Son, embracing the Elect, and providing all the means for their present and eternal Salvation. This of course involves the antiquated dispute about final perseverance. The doctrine of Reprobation is not so prominently exhibited as in the sterner days of Calvin, or even of Jonathan Edwards. Certainly throughout the volume nothing new is presented, either in argument, or statement. No philosophical investigation is attempted, and the Scriptural proofs are usually given, not by way of quotation, but of simple reference. The respectability of culture evinced in the volume, and the spirit of gentleness which it everywhere breathes, shield it from all harsh censure. We do not believe it will greatly enlarge, or enrich, the treasures of Theological Learning, yet in the circle of the Author's friends, or perhaps throughout his denomination, it may be read by thoughtful persons, and confirm them in opinions previously entertained. How difficult in this age of the world to present substantial Theological Truth in those forms which at once impart fire, and nutriment to the soul—awakening all its stirring activities, and at the same time supplying the aliment which preserves energy from exhaustion.

**GREEK THEOLOGY.** 1. Introduction a la Théologie Orthodoxe, de MACAIRE, docteur en théologie, Evêque de Vinnitza, Recteur de l'Académie Ecclesiastique de St. Petersbourg. Traduite par un Russe. Paris, Libraire de Joel Cherbuliez, 10, Rue de la Monnaie. Royal octavo, pp. 715. 2. Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe, par MACAIRE, etc. etc. Tome premier. Royal octavo, pp. 734. 3. Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe, par MACAIRE. Tome second. Royal octavo, pp. 819.

We have not put the titles to these elaborate volumes here, because we expect to give a proper analysis of them, but rather to introduce them to the acquaintance of our readers; and, perhaps, to induce some one to attempt an appropriate review of the Theology of the Greek Church—a paper very highly desirable for these days of inquiry. Too many indulge the stolid idea, that the Greek Church is sleeping over a dead and departed Orthodoxy. But, if large and thorough scientific works show the state of science, and the attention paid to it, in any community, then such a work as this, of Bishop Macarius, proves that Scientific Theology is flourishing in the Greek Church, to an extent of which Protestant Christendom knows little indeed. Scientific Theology in Protestant Christendom is at an exceedingly low and disgraceful ebb. In the Church of England, since the days of Joseph Bingham, the author of the immortal *Origines*, not a work on

Church History, or Systematic Theology, has made its appearance, which can at all compare with *his* production, in the department of Antiquities. Even the works which Bingham, in the preface to his last volume, said other scholars should produce, to render his own labors full and complete enough, have yet no existence; and Bingham died nearly one hundred and fifty years ago! All the learning, all the leisure, and all the opulence, of great Universities, have not accomplished so much as he did, who had but a weak and sickly constitution, and who died a poor country parson, at the comparatively early age of fifty-five.

The age is generally and singularly indifferent about Scientific Theology. A late number of the N. Y. Times, giving an abstract, *in figures*, of the use made of Theological Works, in the libraries of one of our largest and most literary cities, says, that the amount of solid Theological reading is pitifully small, and that the substitute has been, and is, a perusal of the lightest and most frivolous stuff, with which the press now teems.

And yet the Greek Church, which produces, which prints, which reprints, and which translates into foreign tongues, works on Scientific Theology, running through 2,368 royal octavo pages, is religiously altogether behind the age!

To show how thorough is the work before us, and yet how wide its range, we will just refer to what it recommends, as side-studies, to render one an accomplished theologian. The first vol. of Bishop Macarius is an Introduction, and discusses such subjects as Revelation, Inspiration, Interpretation, the Sacred Canon, etc. On pp. 636, 637, he indulges his readers with a conspectus of some parallel sciences, familiarity with which befits a Theologian deserving the venerable name. They are, A history of Religions and of the Church; of Ecclesiastical Geography and Chronology; of Biblical Archæology and Patrology; a history of dogmas, creeds, liturgies, and canon law; a history of Ecclesiastical eloquence and asceticism. The mere mention of these formidable topics is enough to give our queasy, superficial, dilettanti modern students, a huge accession of theological dyspepsia.

We can only say of Bishop Macarius, and those like him, that, if they do reject the "*Filioque*," not as a doctrine, but as an historical error—as an addition to the Nicene Creed, which did not get there by just authority—and yet sympathize with such a portraiture of Scientific Theology as these noble volumes supply, then may Heaven send us such men, for our own schools and churches! If it is not lawful to pray so, we at least cannot help indulging a secret wish, that such men may be added to our Bishops and Doctors!

AMERICAN EDITION OF DR. WILLIAM SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, revised and edited by Prof. H. B. HACKETT, D. D., with the coöperation of EZRA ABBOTT, A. M., A. A. S., Assistant Librarian of Harvard University. Part VII. New York: 1867. Hurd & Houghton.

It cannot be considered strange, that orthodox Christians are sensitive in regard to everything touching Miracles and Prophecy, the two great pillars of Scripture. They would feel otherwise, if they deemed the Word of God a mere publication of His natural Law. Then, the appeal would simply be to its inherent purity, beauty and beneficence, and Reason could, in *itself*, find the demonstration of its truth. The Church, however, in her Creeds, and Articles, and Offices, expresses her belief in Mysteries of Redemption, for which there is no proof in creation, and often scarcely an intimation. She teaches the existence of Three Divine Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, the incarnation of our Lord, the living Presence of the Holy Ghost, the Resurrection of the body, and the Life Everlasting. Here are mysteries in perfect harmony with Eternal Truth, yet forever beyond the grasp of the faculties of any creature. It is difficult to perceive how they could ever be attested to Reason, without a Divine authentication. Hence those who believe that Christianity is not only a system of morality, but also a Mystery of Redemption, must rest their faith on Supernatural proof. Reason thus with them plants herself on those facts of Scripture, appealing to the senses, and supported by what is deemed incontrovertible evidence, which involve Omnipotence in the miracle, and Omniscience in the prophecy.

It is therefore natural, that certain topics should be sought with anxiety in an American Edition of Dr. Smith's Dictionary proceeding from Harvard University, and which, at an immense and most commendable expenditure of energy and money, has concentrated upon itself the best talent and learning of two continents. Take, for instance, the article on Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. Here, it is satisfactory to find a synopsis, rich and full, in accordance with the received inculcations of the Church. Its genuineness and authenticity are pronounced beyond question. The skeptical speculations of German criticism are considered baseless. Even the *added notes* seem to cast no shade on the inspiration of the Epistle.

In the biographical sketches of Elijah and Elisha, there is no hesitation in calling the supernatural facts miraculous. They have both proceeded from a reliable pen, and are admirable, as regards the fullness of the information and the felicity of the style. The allusion at the end, by *another hand*, to Stanley's History of the Jewish Church, caused regret, and induced a second perusal of his book, to ascertain the correctness of former impressions. Certainly nothing can be more insidious than his comments, now using the language of Scripture, and seeming to admit the miracle, then, by an unexpected word, a sudden suggestion, an artful reflection, conveying the impression that the whole narration is a legend or a myth, obscured in the mists of a rude and superstitious antiquity.

The Article on Egypt speaks most unequivocally of the wonderful and exact fulfillments of prophecy everywhere visible in the land of the Nile. If the Chronological speculations are not all to be approved, they at least evince a modesty and fairness, becoming those who grope for truth over the defaced fragments found amid the ruins of centuries. In the appended *note*, the wild astronomical speculations of Prof. Smyth of the University of Edinburgh, are endorsed. The astronomer Royal, of Scotland, himself endeavored to avoid the force of his own conclusions against the truth of the Scripture, by impeaching Manetho's list, and following Osburn in his *Monumental History of Egypt*, abbreviating the earlier dynasties. The annotator, however, supposes that evidences unknown to Osburn, and overlooked by Smith,—the Tablet of Memphis, discovered by M. Mariette, and that of Sethos by M. Dümichen—collated with the Turin papyrus, furnish an almost unbroken list of kings, and would place *Menes* B. C. 3000 years, and long before the flood. It is thus, the vaguest speculations from the vaguest data, by the vaguest minds, are employed against the plain teachings of the divine oracles.

However these additions may be regretted as blemishes, this vast work remains one of the noblest proofs of united British and American learning and enterprise, and doubtless comprises more instruction on Biblical subjects, than any similar dictionary ever published. Nor should the Christian scholar, whose Faith rests both on Reason and Experience, fear any possible assault, either open or insidious. Praying to the Holy Spirit for light, for guidance, and having in view the glory of his Saviour he may boldly seek truth in every region of Literature, Science and Theology.

A SUGGESTIVE COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT, St. Luke. By the Rev. U. H. VAN DOREN. New York: 1868. D. Appleton & Co. Two volumes, 12mo., pp. 520-528.

This work evinces some scholarship and large research. If there is nothing particularly new in the matter, there is at least great novelty in the form. The capitalization of the first letter in each line, the studied repetition of certain words, the frequent omission of articles, and connectives, with the alliterations, make the comments at first have the appearance of verse. You are, however, on nearer inspection, speedily displeased to discover that these arrangements are to produce a sententiousness which may arrest attention, and a brevity which may assist memory, with perhaps some view to impress you with the originality of the author. Such methods we most heartily disapprove, as leading to affectation, and impairing the purity of style. Where there is substantial learning, there need never be a resort to artifice. If these volumes contain healthful aliment, needed by the Church, the labor of the author would not be lost, should he forfeit his title to originality, and reduce them to another form.



FRITHIOF'S SAGA, from the Swedish of Esaias Tegnér, Bishop of Wexio. By the Rev. WILLIAM LEAREY BLACKLEY, M.A. First American edition, edited by BAYARD TAYLOR. New York: 1867. Leypoldt & Holt. 8vo., pp. 201.

It would be impossible to forget the glow of delight and admiration, once kindled by an old number of an English Quarterly, containing extracts from the Poetry of Northern Europe. Youth had indeed been familiar with the names of Thorwaldsen, and Derzhaven, and Miss Bremer, but the artist, the poet and the novelist seemed like brilliant tropical exotics, whose seeds had been carried to strange and sterile regions. It was never imagined, that in Sweden, and Russia, and Denmark, the fire of genius had been burning for centuries amid those northern snows. Let any man study, especially, the literature of Sweden and Denmark, and he will be struck with a force, originality and culture, which elevate their best poets to a rank the highest British genius may not disdain. Nor was the mental growth of those nations spasmodic and unnatural. From the rude and simple utterances of Scandinavian Skalds to the immortal FRITHIOF of Tegnér, there was a long and illustrious succession. Here the glory of the north has culminated, and it may be ages before this work has a rival. The *Frithiof* expresses the very heart of Sweden. It is as much the national epic, as was the *Iliad*, of Greece, the *Æneid*, of Rome, or the *Jerusalem Delivered*, of Italy. The theme embraced everything which could excite Swedish pride, express Swedish feelings, embody Swedish tradition, or delight Swedish taste. Hence the universal popularity of the poem. It lives in the national mind. It is studied, it is recited, it is loved. The plan has all the unity of a true Epic. The heroic adventures of *Frithiof*, his noble character and fiery nature are dignified and interesting. The meekness, the purity, the fidelity of Ingeborg are described with the most delicate skill. He,

"Strong as the oak, and towering high,  
Straight as a tall lance toward the sky,  
Its struggling, wind-tost summit, blown  
Like helmet plumes."

While Ingeborg, like the fragile rose,  
When Winter, parting, melts the snows,  
And Spring's sweet breath bids flowers arise,  
Still, in the bud, unconscious lies."

The dark Kelgo, and the gay Kalfdan, resemble the gloom of midnight, and the glow of morning. There are scenes of tenderness, and of sublimity, difficult to find surpassed in any language. The mythology, the traditions, the manners, the scenery of the North are everywhere so interwoven, the plot is so well sustained, the characters are so admirably preserved, that you seem to live amid those wintry plains, and ocean wastes. Here, if anywhere, are united, the refinement, the grace, the culture of modern times, with the simplicity, the fire, the sublimity, of a remote antiquity. While it would be absurd to read Homer, or Virgil, or Milton, in any other than their own heroic measure, yet it certainly appears reasonable that the verse should correspond to the subject, and the variety of Tegnér is admirable. For him at least, the same success would be otherwise impossible. We cannot forbear recording the wish that all the poetical treasures of Northern Europe will be made accessible to our country, by translations much more excellent than this of Mr. Blackley. We believe the American Editor would have expressed the Swedish Poet, better than the English Divine.

THE DUTY AND DISCIPLINE OF EXTEMPORARY PREACHING. By F. BARHAM ZINCKE, Vicar of Wherstead, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. The first American from the second London Edition. New York, 1867. Charles Scribner. 12 mo., pp. 262.

We have not found this book, either in the excellence of its style, or the power of its argument, what might have been expected from a Clergyman, having, in the Church of England, such a position as the author. The allusions to his own experience are not pleasing. Yet to certain minds, the volume may be of greater practical benefit than a more elegant and philosophical treatment of the subject.



The whole question of Preaching is surrounded with difficulties. Some clergymen succeed best in reading; others, in extemporaneous delivery, while a few can adopt either method, according to theme, or inclination, or circumstances. Much can be said on both sides, and, when arguments are exhausted, opinions remain unchanged. The extemporaneous style is certainly better for hortatory addresses, expository discourses, and promiscuous assemblies, while the manuscript seems more suitable for exhaustive treatment, and cultivated audiences. When the fires of youth have expended themselves, or the system has been exhausted by labor, or disease, age is comforted by the conscious possession of a goodly supply of written sermons. That man is perhaps wise, who endeavors to combine in himself the clearness and precision produced by frequent composition, with the fluency, the fervor, the impressiveness which characterize the extemporaneous orator. After all that is advanced, it is not probable the habits of many clergymen will be materially changed.

**THE TURK AND THE GREEK, OR CREEDS, RACES, SOCIETY AND SCENERY IN TURKEY, GREECE AND THE ISLES OF GREECE.** By S. G. U. BENJAMIN. New York, 1867. Hurd & Houghton. 12 mo., pp. 268.

This is certainly a readable book. The style is sparkling, the descriptions are sprightly and if the volume is not profound, it is interesting. The author has felt the inspiration of his theme, and writes under the glow it kindles. Indeed stupidity alone could remain unmoved amid such scenes. What associations are connected with the Golden Horn, and with Greece, and the Mediterranean Isles! As we stand before the mosque of St. Sophia, or the seraglio of the Sultan, what questions suggest themselves! Shall the palace of the Czar be transported to the shores of the Bosphorus, and the priests of the Greek Church chant beneath that matchless dome, which has so long echoed the name of the Prophet, while the crescent is displaced by the cross? Shall the result be peacefully achieved, or only by convulsions deluging Europe with blood? Shall the pure worship of Jesus be again freely celebrated over the land of His nativity by the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church? As the dominion of the Pope arose with that of the Prophet, shall they sink together into darkness? But these serious questions are not discussed in the gay and sprightly book we are noticing; and we repress all temptation to sober disquisition, by recommending it to those who wish to spend in fancy an agreeable hour amid the most beautiful of scenes, and beneath the brightest of skies.

**CONDENSED FRENCH INSTRUCTION, consisting of Grammar and Exercises with Cross References.** By C. J. DELILE. First American from the thirteenth London Edition. New York, 1868. Leypoldt & Holt. F. U. Christern. 16 mo. pp. 143.

There is scarcely any more difficult task than the preparation of a Grammar. To select what is essential, to omit what is unimportant, to compose suitable exercises, to express rules in condensed and suggestive forms, which will assist instead of burdening memory, and gradually to conduct the pupil from the simple elements of language to an acquaintance, at once philosophical and practical, are ends more frequently than successfully attempted. It is gratifying to notice the numerous and persevering efforts made to render the French attainable in our country. The ever-increasing facilities of intercourse and the wide-spread use of the language over both continents, have stimulated this enterprise of scholars. We hope the Grammar of Mr. Delile will reach as many editions in America as have been published in England.

**ELEMENTARY ARITHMETIC, for the Slate, in which Methods and Rules are based upon Principles established by Induction.** By JOHN H. FRENCH, LL. D. New York, 1867. Harper & Brothers. 12 mo. 220 pp.

We are really glad to see, in an Elementary Arithmetic, a return to the old way of using the slate. The very possession of so important an article is a stimulus to the child. Armed with slate and pencil he can achieve greater things. Beside,

why should the commencing boy be denied the assistance of the eye in his mental operations, and be thrown back entirely on the difficult processes of abstract reasoning? The space devoted to notation and numeration in this volume is unusually large, and shows the author desirous to lay a solid foundation, whereas generally this elementary and essential part of Arithmetic is most crudely treated, and imperfectly understood. The definitions are clear, simple, concise and comprehensive, and we truly hope the Book will remedy a defect which has been felt by many teachers, notwithstanding the multiplied efforts made in this department of instruction.

**A MANUAL OF ANGLO-SAXON FOR BEGINNERS**, comprising a Grammar, Reader and Glossary with Explanatory Notes. By SAMUEL SHUTE, Professor in Columbian College, Washington, D. C. New York. Leypoldt & Holt, 1867. 12mo., 195 pp.

It is difficult to comprehend, why there should be any strife between the admirers of the Anglo-Saxon and those of the Classic Languages. In all that requires rapid description, vehement exhortation, or pathetic appeal—in all pertaining to the heart and the conduct, there must be a resort to the former; but the latter will be more frequently employed in scientific definition, in literary disquisition, and where the sublimity of the thought is allied to the lofty rather than the intense. Surely the wise writer will press into service all authorized words which suit his purposes, from whatever vocabulary drawn. But the Sax-on foundation of our Language, however plain, will always deserve more attention than the classic superstructure, however ornamental, and we regard with pleasure every attempt which acquaints us with those words forming the basis of our noble English tongue. The Manual which suggests these reflections, comprises a brief Grammar, a Glossary, with extracts from the Anglo-Saxon, both in Prose and Poetry. The plan we conceive to be excellent. This Book will contribute to spread an amount of practical information which can never be made accessible to the ordinary reader by mere translations with explanatory notes, or by the most learned and philosophical dissertations. If a Second Edition is demanded, it is desirable that the work should descend into still greater detail, and be enlarged by more numerous extracts, especially in the department of Poetry.

**DUFF'S BOOK-KEEPING BY SINGLE AND DOUBLE ENTRY**, Practically illustrating Merchants', Manufacturers', Private Bankers', Rail Road and National Bank Accounts, including all the late improvements in the Science, with a copious Index. By P. DUFF, formerly Merchant, Founder and Proprietor of Duff's Mercantile College, of Pittsburgh, Pa. New York, 1868. Harper & Brothers. 4 to., 400 pp.

The author's long and large experience as a Teacher have given him peculiar advantages in preparing a work adapted to the practical demands of all descriptions of accountants. Scarcely anything more will be perhaps needed in this department than occasional wise accommodations to the changes of the times. We suggest that a smaller volume, suited to Colleges, and those having in view professional life, might become exceedingly useful in teaching literary men many lessons, of which they are generally and most inconveniently ignorant.

**THE PIONEER CHURCH**, or the Story of a New Parish in the West. By the Rev. M. SCHUYLER, D. D., Rector of Christ's Church, St. Louis. 1867. Riverside Press. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 12 mo., 211 pp.

This sweet story is fresh and pure as a spring prairie flower. It not only illustrates, in a most lively and interesting way, the enterprise and earnestness of Western life, but also the success of Lay effort, when sustained by faith and love. It should have a circulation in our Sunday Schools, and be followed by others from the same pen. We would suggest, that the touching and beautiful extract from our late venerated Presiding Bishop, is liable to misinterpretation by chil-

dren. He, in one place, uses the generic term *prayer*, where he evidently intends simply one of its parts, *thanksgiving*, and might by the thoughtless be understood to teach the strange doctrine, that Christians in this world of sin and death may supplicate in behalf of saints forever saved in glory before the Redeemer's Throne. All the conditions of his eloquent argument are fulfilled, by regarding the words of the Prayer for the Church Militant as expressions of gratitude for the grace bestowed on the servants of God departed this life in His faith and fear, instead of petitions in their behalf.

THE CHURCH, ROME, AND DISSENT. By the REV. W. HERBERT SMYTHE, Incumbent of Christ's Church, Tamworth. Kingston: John Creighton. New York: H. B. Durand. 12 mo., 327 pp.

The argument for the Church, pursued from the Primitive ages, is two edged—at the same time cutting away the excrescences of Romish corruptions, and the wild growths of Sectarianism. To obtain its whole force, it is absolutely necessary to remember that the true Faith and Order were introduced into Britain in Apostolic times; that they were never wholly suppressed by Papal tyrannies, and that the Reformation was simply their resuscitation to a new life. The Church was not one of many fragments, thrown up by the convulsion of that great epoch; but was the old edifice, standing on eternal foundations, and once more revealed in the beauty of her ancient proportions. The work of Mr. Smythe demonstrates this fact. It also shows most clearly, how great the departure from the Apostolic System, recognised by fifteen centuries, was the organization of religious bodies by an unordained Calvin, and an unauthorized Wesley. The volume is admirably adapted to popular use, and should be seen in every Parish Library.

ECCE ECCLESIA. An Essay, showing the essential identity of the Church in all ages. 1868. New York: Blelock & Co. 12mo. 576 pp.

We confess that we were never more disappointed in any book. The title, "Ecce Ecclesia," presented it to our minds in some connection with the works styled "Ecce Homo" and "Ecce Deus." We expected scholarly culture, and perhaps an antidote to widely spread error. We hoped for something that would add to the stability of Christian faith, and extend the circle of Christian knowledge. The whole object, however, of quotation, and comment, and criticism, and attempted argument, is to show, what really we supposed no orthodox author ever questioned, that the New Dispensation, in its relations to the Old, was not an antagonism, but a development. All the writers, so tediously cited, and so presumptuously criticised, obviously had no other view, but simply intended to express an opposition, not in itself, but in the misapprehension of blinded Jews, or else in some subordinate particulars. This anonymous author treats with contempt, scholars so far beneath him, as Dwight, Kitto, Conybeare, Howson, Olshausen, Burkitt and numerous others, equally inferior in learning; or, if he designs them a passing word of commendation, it is with the complacent air of the pedagogue, who strokes a boy's head with a smirk of condescending superiority. We see in the book no single token of the Church, and cannot but feel that the title was adopted, as is sometimes a foreign costume, to give a more easy and successful circulation. But in both cases, detection aggravates indignation. The volume is the evident production of an illogical and half-disciplined mind, filled with extensive stores of badly digested knowledge, where the abundance of the acquisition only makes more manifest the want of mastery by a controlling and discriminating intellect.

HISTORY OF THE UNITED NETHERLANDS, FROM THE DEATH OF WILLIAM THE SILENT TO THE TWELVE YEARS TRUCE.—1609. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D. C. L., Corresponding member of the Institute of France. Author of the "Rise of the Dutch Republic." In four volumes. Vol. III, 1590-1600. With portraits. New York. 1868. Harper & Brothers. 8vo., 599 pp.

Where lies the power of Mr. Motley? He does not resemble the classic models. He has neither the grace of Herodotus, the sweetness of Xenophon, the terseness of Thucydides, the dramatic picturing of Livy, or the intensity and sententiousness

of Tacitus. He does not exhibit the purity which characterizes the style of Hume, or the stateliness which marks that of Gibbon. He cannot compare in taste with Irving, in brilliancy with Prescott, or in intellectual breadth and grasp with Bancroft. Yet no man can read his works, without solid instruction, and deep interest. You forget an occasional roughness of expression, a vulgar phrase, a grammatical inaccuracy, an approach to a Carlyleism. You surrender yourself to the resistless energy of the narration, and are hurried by a certain fascination of intensity through battles and sieges, and intrigues, until you confess yourself under the spell of a masterly intellect. In the conflict of Ivry, you see the white plume of Henry go down in the shock, and, suddenly emerging from his peril, you hear the very shout of victory. His siege of Paris, his base recantation, the midnight surprise, when he entered his capital, are most vividly delineated. The whole character of the bloody and detestable Philip is drawn with power, while the descriptions of the closing scenes of his gloomy life, and of the vast extent of his fortuitous and misgoverned Empire, are not often surpassed. Mr. Motley's "Rise of the Dutch Republic," and his "History of the United Netherlands," will probably take a place in the permanent literature of the world.

Small blemishes will not obscure so much acknowledged excellence. It is certainly marvellous, that an American should enter the libraries of Europe, and, before her most august intellects, really open a new province of History, and by the genius of industry, make countries, before comparatively unnoticed, take their true place in the estimation of the world. It is like constructing from the ruins of the eternal city, another republican Rome.

We are pained to notice some remarks, which we fear may give encouragement to skepticism. Can the following passage be mistaken? "A day of civilization may come perhaps sooner or later, when it will be of no earthly consequence to their fellow creatures, to *what Creed, what Christian Church, what religious dogma, kings or humbler individuals may be partial.*" The clause succeeding, scarcely relieves the objectionable inference. In the conclusion of the volume, we have a noticeable departure from the Chronology of the Scripture. He says, "For the few centuries, or year-thousands of which there is definite record, are as nothing compared to the *millions of unnumbered years, during which man has perhaps walked the earth.*" And he again speaks of "general rules for the *infinite future, during which our species may be intended to inhabit this planet.*"

If Mr. Motley is a sincere believer in Christianity, we should be sorry to see an influence based on so solid a foundation of learning, industry, and talent, turned, by expressions thus unguarded, against our Holy Religion; or if he designed an insidious attack, we would be equally grieved that so manly an intellect would not be more open in its assault. But in any case, the literary merit of his volumes will make them a benefit to the world, and probably an enduring monument to the glory of his country.

QUEEN VICTORIA'S JOURNAL; OUR LIFE IN THE HIGHLANDS. Edited by Arthur Helps. New York. 1868. Harper & Brothers. Chicago; S. C. Griggs & Co. 12mo., 287 pp.

Queen Victoria's "Life of the Prince Consort," and the volume whose title we have just written, so unpretending in themselves, are made remarkable by their royal authorship. When Louis Napoleon wrote his biography of the great Roman, it was quite palpable that his uncle was the modern Julius, and he the immortal Augustus, whose business it was, to unite, strengthen, and adorn a Latin Empire.

The baths, and palaces, and temples, which arose in marble and gold over the seven hills of the eternal city, were to have their resemblances in the splendid improvements which more than ever have made Paris a centre of beauty and luxury. How much the French Monarch gained by his literary venture, may be questionable. We know, however, that the whole scheme was a policy. That Queen Victoria could have had any political motive, in exposing her heart and her home to the world, is impossible. The publication of her books was not the dictate of her head. Nothing could better evince the gentleness, the purity, the beauty of her character. It is delightful to remark her maternal interest in her family, her friends and her people. The modest claims of her books, her character as a

woman, and her position as a Queen, will shield her from harsh criticism, while the masses of her subjects will be pleased with that condescension which unveils to their gaze the sanctities of her affections and her palaces. Especially will severity be softened into silence, when we consider that these volumes have traces of the tears of widowhood, striving in part to relieve its sorrow by sharing with others the sacredness of its memories. We therefore omit any critical review, believing that, if the Queen has added nothing to the treasures of literature, she has done much to purify and elevate the domestic affections. And yet, in reading her books, we cannot but ask ourselves, if the time has arrived in history, when the Sovereign can be disconnected from the State. Now, when a revolution has been initiated in England, which must affect the nobility, the Church, and at last the Throne—when men are so fearfully losing respect for the past, and veneration for the Law—when the popular element is seeking to engulf the entire social, ecclesiastical, and political system of Great Britain, it seems strange that her Majesty should throw aside the reserve which usually veils the heart and the home, and expose their sanctities to the gaze of the curious and the cynical. We trust, however, that so far from diminishing the respect due to one of the most pious and popular of England's Queens, it will, by its pictures of domestic purity and joy, assist in raising the affections of her people, into a barrier of resistance against all stormy violence of a revolution, approaching and inevitable, and it is to be hoped, salutary.

STORIES OF THE GORILLA COUNTRY, narrated for Young People. By PAUL DU CHAILLU. Author of "Discoveries in Equatorial Africa," etc. With numerous illustrations. 1868. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo., 292 pp.

This volume contains descriptions of some marvellous adventures, and cannot fail to entertain the young.

THE CHAPEL WINDOW. By FANFAN. Published through the offerings of the Sunday School of Trinity Church, Geneva, N. Y. Gen. Prot. Epis., Sunday School Union and Church Book Society, 760 Broadway, N. Y. 1867. 16mo., pp. 186.

FOLKS AND FAIRIES. Stories for little children. By LUCY RANDALL COMFORT. With engravings. New York. 1868. Harper & Brothers. 12mo., pp. 259.

HOME LIFE IN AFRICA, OR A NEW GLIMPSE INTO AN OLD CORNER OF THE WORLD. Written for the young people, by one of their friends who went there. Boston. 1868. A. Williams & Co. 12mo., pp. 184.

This little work is written by a Missionary, who proposes devoting its profits to the education of an African boy. Its object, and its merit, give it a double title to notice. We hope it will have an extensive sale, and find a place in all our Sunday School Libraries.

FRED, MARIA, AND ME. By the author of the "Flower of the Family." Illustrated by W. Magrath. New York. 1868. Scribner & Co. 12mo., pp. 71.

LIBRARY OF SELECT NOVELS. 1868. By Harper & Brothers. 1868. New York. Containing the following:

No. 304. GUILD COURT. A London Story. By GEORGE MACDONALD.

No. 306. PLAYING FOR HIGH STAKES. By ANNIE THOMAS.

No. 307. MARGARET'S ENGAGEMENT.

No. 308. ONE OF THE FAMILY. By the Author of "Carlyon's Year."

No. 310. BROWNLOWS. By Mrs. OLIPHANT. Author of "Agnes" &c.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY. March, 1868. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE. LITTELL & GAY. No. 30 Bromfield St., Boston.

CASSELL'S MAGAZINE. February, 1868. London: Cassell, Peter & Galpin. Ludgate Hill, and 596 Broadway, New York.

- THE PEOPLE'S MAGAZINE. London Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. 77 Great Queen Street, U. C. New York: Pott & Amery, 5 and 13 Cooper Union.
- THE CHRISTIAN WORLD. Magazine of the American and Foreign Christian Union. New York. Published by the Society. 156 Chambers Street.
- OUR YOUNG FOLKS. An illustrated Magazine for Boys and Girls. Edited by J. T. TROWBRIDGE, GAIL HAMILTON, and LUCY LARCOM. 1868. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. Subscription office for New York City and Brooklyn, 63 Bleecker St., New York.
- PROCEEDINGS at the Thirty Fourth anniversary of the Bishop White Prayer Book Society, with the annual Report of the Board of Managers, and of the Treasurer, Philadelphia. 1867. King and Baird, Printers, 607 Sansom Street.
- CATALOGUE OF HOBART COLLEGE. 1867-1868.
- THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION of the Charitable Associations of Christ's Church, New York: Francis, Hart & Co., 63 Cortland Street.
- THE SIXTH ANNUAL CATALOGUE of St. Stephen's College. Annandale, New York. 1867-1868. Albany: J. Munsell, 82 State St.
- BISHOP GRISWOLD ON THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE. No. 1344 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.
- EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT of the American Church Missionary Society, 1866-1867.
- STATEMENT of the Missionary Convocation of Northern New York, and Map of its Field. 1868. Albany, N. Y.; Charles Van Benthuysen & Sons.
- THE MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCER. A Record of Diocesan Missions in Pennsylvania. Philadelphia, 1868. King & Baird, 607 Sansom St.
- THE LIBERTY OF PREACHING. Its Warrant and Relations. By Rev. STEPHEN H. TYNG, JR. New York. 1867. John A. Gray & Green, 16 and 18 Jacob Street.
- THE SCOTTISH GUARDIAN. Aberdeen: A. Brown & Co., 77 Union Street. Glasgow: D. Bryce & Co., Buchanan Street. London: I. Masters.
- THE TWENTY-FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor. New York: John F. Trow & Co., 50 Greene Street.
- HALL'S JOURNAL OF HEALTH, 1868. New York: No. 2 West Forty-Third Street.
- REPORT of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Society for the Increase of the Ministry, and of the Board of Directors, held in Christ's Church, and St. Ann's Church, N. Y., Oct. 13 and 15, 1867. Hartford: Press of Wiley, Waterman & Eaton.
- THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. A Lecture. By the Rev. WM. B. CORBYN, D.D., Rector of St. Paul's College, Palmyra, Mo. 1867.
- CITY MISSIONS. By Rev. WM. A. MCVICKAR, M.A. Second Edition. 1868. New York: Pott & Amery.
- THE CHURCH THE SOURCE AND CENTRE OF STABILITY. Annual Sermon preached before the Society for the increase of the Ministry. In Christ's Church, N. Y., Oct. 13th 1867. By Rev. WM. F. MORGAN, D. D., Rector of St. Thomas' Church, New York.
- THE TEMPLE. An Address delivered at the Laying of the Corner Stone of St. Paul's Church, Washington, D. C., Nov. 8th, 1867. By the Rev. CHARLES H. HALL, D. D., Rector of the Church of the Epiphany. Washington, D. C.: MCGILL & WITHERAN.
- BIBLE SOCIETY RECORD, Feb. 1868. New York.

- SERMON before the Convocation of Northern New York. By the Rev. ROBERT LOWELL, D. D. Church Press Company. 1867. Hartford, Conn.
- OLD ISSUES UNDER NEW TERMS. A Letter addressed to Rev. J. J. McELHINNY, D. D. 1867. New York: John A. Gray & Green, 16 and 18 Jacob Street.
- CATALOGUE of Juvenile and Miscellaneous Works, Illustrated. Pott & Amery, 5 and 13 Cooper Union, Fourth Avenue, New York. 1867.
- SECOND ANNUAL REPORT of the Metropolitan Board of Excise. 1867. New York: A. C. Rogers & Co., 26 John Street.
- THE CHURCHMAN'S ALMANAC. for the year of our Lord 1868. New York. Gen. Prot. Epis. Union, 762 Broadway.
- THE YOUNG CHRISTIAN SOLDIER. 1868. Domestic Missions, Protestant and Episcopal Church, 17 Bible House, New York.
- THE NEW ENGLANDER. Edited by Prof. GEORGE P. FISHER, Prof. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, and WILLIAM L. KINGSLEY. January, 1868. New Haven: Thomas J. Stafford.
- THE BAPTIST QUARTERLY. January, 1868. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 530 Arch St.
- THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY, and PRINCETON REVIEW. Edited by CHARLES HODGE, D. D. Philadelphia: Peter Walker, 821 Chestnut St.
- THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND ARTS. Conducted by Profs. B. SILIMAN & JAMES D. DANA, in connection with Profs. ASA GRAY & WOLCOTT GIBBS, of Cambridge, and Profs. S. W. JOHNSON, GEO. J. BRUSH, and H. A. NEWTON, of New Haven. January, 1868. New Haven.
- EPISCOPACY and THE PRAYER BOOK. A Contribution to the Unity of the Church. Richard McCauley, No. 1314 Chestnut St. Philadelphia.
- A LETTER TO THE REV. RICHARD NEWTON, D. D. By the Rt. Rev. W. R. WHITTINGHAM.
- THE CHURCH PENNY MAGAZINE. By Rev. R. WHITTINGHAM, Editor. 1868. New Haven.
- HOLIDAY CATALOGUE of the General Protestant Episcopal S. S. Union, and Book Society. C. G. Houston, Agent. Depository, 762 Broadway, N. Y.
- A STATEMENT of the objects of the Society for the Education and Advancement of young Seamen. New York. 1868. Holt Brothers, 104 William St.
- THE SCHOOL REGISTER. New York, February, 1868. Church School Agency, 86 E. Ninth St., N. Y. Rev. JAMES E. KENNY.
- A COMPREHENSIVE DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, mainly abridged from Dr. W. SMITH, with important additions and improvements. Illustrated with five hundred engravings. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 443 and 445 Broadway.
- THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, January, 1868. New York: the Leonard Scott Publishing Co., 140 Fulton Street.

The articles in this number, on Don Carlos, and Philip II, Liberal Education in England, and Sir Philip Francis, are recommended as admirable. While the Foreign Quarterlies may not exhibit their former brilliancy of style, they have not depreciated in exhaustive treatment, while they have certainly improved in dignity and urbanity towards opponents.



# ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

## SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

### ORDINATIONS.

#### DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Rt. Rev. Bishop</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Fisher, George,	Potter,	Jan. 19, 1868,	Ch. of the Resurrection, N. Y.
Fleming, James,	Johns,	Jan 17, "	Theo.Sem.Chap., Alexandria, Va.
Hume, J. N.	Kip,	Jan. 5, "	St. James, San Francisco, Cal.
Sumner, William G.	Williams,	Dec. 28, 1867,	Trinity Church, New Haven, Ct.

#### PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Rt. Rev. Bishop</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Beaubien, J. B. C.	Potter,	Dec. 21, 1867,	Gen. Theo.Sem. Chapel, N. Y.
" Caskey, T. F.	Potter,	Jan. 19, 1868,	Ch. of the Resurrection, N. Y.
" Falls, Nelson,	Whitt'gham,	Dec. 23, 1867,	Grace Church, Baltimore, Md.
" Girault, J. F.	Wilmer,	Dec. 1, "	St. Luke's, New Orleans, La.
" Hayward, Wm. S.	Coxe,	Dec. 22, "	Rome, N. Y.
" Heaton, W. S.	Stevens,	Feb. 18, 1868,	Scranton, Pa.
" Kellogg, Justin B.	Bedell,	Feb. 23, "	St. Andrew's, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Laramour, W. J.	Whitt'gham,	Dec. 22, 1867,	Grace Church, Baltimore, Md.
" Morgan, Brockholst,	Odenheimer,	Dec. 28, "	St. Stephen's, Millburn, N. J.
" Murray, James,	Southgate,	Feb. 23, 1868,	Zion Church, N. Y.
" Pratt, James E.	Williams,	Dec. 23, 1867,	St. Paul's, Hartford, Ct.
" Reed, Mr.	Lee,	Dec. 6, "	St. Andrew's, Wilmington, Del.
" Rice, F. F.	Potter,	Jan. 19, 1868,	Ch. of the Resurrection, N. Y.
" Selleck, C. M.	Williams,	Dec. 21, 1867,	St. Paul's, Norwalk, Ct.
" Stryker, Wilson P.	Whitt'gham,	Dec. 22, "	Grace Church, Baltimore, Md.
" Warriner, E. A.	Stevens,	Jan. 6, 1868,	Lancaster, Pa.
" Upjohn, Samuel,	Williams,	Nov. 24, 1867,	St. James, New London, Ct.

### CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Rt. Rev. Bishop</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
St. John's,	Kip,	Oct. 13, 1867,	Goldhill, Cal.
Calvary,	Kip,	Oct. 27, "	Santa Cruz, Cal.
St. George's,	Potter,	Dec. 19, "	New York City.
St. James's,	Bedell,	Dec. 19, "	Wooster, Ohio.
St. Mary's,	Whipple,	Jan. 28, "	Basswood Grove, Minn.

### OBITUARIES.

The Rev. BEARDSLEY NORTHROP died Dec. 12th, 1867, in Utica, N. Y., in the 78th year of his age, and the 47th year of his ministry. He was born in New Milford, Conn., January 18th, 1790. His parents were in the Church. He was ordained to the Diaconate by Bishop Brownell, May 2d, 1821, at New Haven, and to the Priesthood, June 5th, 1822. His first Parish was Oxford, and his second, Trun-

bull, both in the Diocese of Connecticut. In May, 1825, he was transferred to the Diocese of New York, and became Rector of Hobart Parish, where he remained four years. He was thence, successively, in Windham, Perryville, Fayetteville, Lockport, Moravia and Jordan. In 1846, he came to Utica, where he labored in connection with Mission services, resulting in the organization of Calvary Church, Cornhill. After about six years, he removed to New Hartford, and was placed on the list of Infirm Clergy, but, about a year before his death, returned to Utica. He was a meek, faithful, self-denying, laborious Clergyman, and, after abundant and successful labor, passed away, serenely, to the presence of his Master.

The Rev. DANIEL LE BARON GOODWIN, for nearly thirty years Rector of St. John's Church, Wilkesonville, in the Diocese of Massachusetts, died, in the 68th year of his age, in Providence, on the evening of Dec. 25th, 1867.

The Rev. GEORGE S. CARRAWAY died at his residence in Hanover, in the Diocese of Virginia, on the 16th of December, 1867, by apoplexy. He entered the Theological Seminary in 1842, graduated, and was ordained in 1845. He first was Rector of the Churches in Middlesex, but twelve years since removed to Hanover, where he expired.

'The Rev J. B. HENRY, Rector of Emmanuel Church, Cumberland, Maryland, died January 1st, 1868.' This brief record recalled the manly and noble form, and Christian urbanity, of this departed Clergyman, seen, on a recent occasion, by the writer, attracted by the beautiful mountain scenery, to linger in the village, and inspect the Parish Church, of Cumberland, so remarkable for its commanding position, and graceful proportions.

The Rev. JAMES GILBURNE LYONS, D. D., of West Haverford, Philadelphia, died from erysipelas, on February 2d, 1868.

Dr. Lyons was born in England; he came to this country about 24 years ago, and has been, since that time, engaged in clerical duties, joined with those of a teacher. His first charge was that of Assistant Minister of St. Mary's Church, Burlington, at the time that Bishop Doane was the Rector. Here he remained only for a short time, and then removed to Philadelphia, and opened a classical and preparatory School, of a superior grade, remarkable for the scholarship of graduates.

The Rev. THOMAS ATKINS died at Farmingdale, Me., January 22d, 1868, in the sixty-fifth year of his age. He was born in Mt. Vernon, Maine. When a Methodist preacher, his attention was arrested by the Prayer Book, and he subsequently became a Clergyman of the Church. He was a most godly man, and laborious minister. He passed away without a struggle, to realize in Heaven those words, so dear to him on earth,—"whether we live therefore or die, we are the Lord's."

The Rt. Rev. JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D. D., LL. D., D. C. L., Bishop of Vermont, and Presiding Bishop of the Church in the United States, suddenly seized with a congestion of the lungs, expired January 9th, 1868, at Burlington, Vt.

Perhaps no death in this country has, throughout the Church in England and America, excited such deep and general grief, as that of the noble and venerable personage, whose name we have just written. His strength of intellect, his extensive learning, his cultivated taste in art, united to a creative genius in music, painting, and architecture, his genial manners, his noble courage, his impressive presence, his successful authorship,—his faith, his zeal, his activity,—his varied gifts as Lawyer, Writer, Teacher, Poet, Preacher, Bishop,—his Leadership at home, and his recent prominence among the highest Episcopal Dignitaries from all the world in Council abroad, furnish an explanation why the hearts and minds of all classes, including even opponents, have been moved to lamentations so universal, and eulogies so glowing. A physical and intellectual manhood, refined by culture, and consecrated to Religion, commands the spontaneous homage of humanity.

The family of Bishop Hopkins removed from England to Ireland about the beginning of the Sixteenth Century. He was born in Dublin, January 30th, 1792. He was nearly related to Stephen Hopkins, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. He accompanied his parents, in 1800, to Philadelphia. Al-

though, for a brief period, at the Academy of Bordentown, N. J., he was principally educated by a mother, remarkable for accomplishments fitting her to develop and mould such a son. Painting and music received his early attention. He even assisted Wilson in preparing plates for some of his immortal Ornithological volumes. After disappointments in business at Pittsburgh, occasioned by the prostrations of the war, he turned his attention to the Law, and soon had the promise of a brilliant career, both as regards wealth and reputation. Within him, he felt, however, a Divine impulse to a higher vocation, and with characteristic decision and nobility, abandoned his prospects of worldly advancement, for the Church. He was ordained, and elected Rector of Trinity Parish, Pittsburgh. In 1826, and again in 1829, he was Clerical Deputy to the General Convention, and was prominent in its debates. During the interval between these dates, he was nominated as Assistant to the venerable Bishop White, and, in a close contest, urged to cast a ballot for himself. This he refused, and, voting generously for Dr. Onderdonk, terminated the controversy.

Having been admirably prepared by his educational labors at Pittsburgh, he was elected Professor of Systematic Divinity in the Theological Seminary, and Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, Boston, then under the Rectorship of Dr., afterwards Bishop, Doane.

In 1832, Vermont having been constituted a Diocese, he was elevated to its Episcopate, and called to show, that, with limited resources, and in a contracted sphere, manly energy of will and intellect, taking inspiration from the recollection of the Cross and the hope of the Crown, may mark out for itself a career of usefulness, which shall command the love of the Church, and the admiration of the world. In his new field, he was Rector, Teacher, Bishop. Here he founded an Episcopal Institute. Here he made sacrifices and endured labors in the cause of Christian education, such as are seldom recorded. Here he nobly donated the lands and buildings of the Institution he established, to the Church. There is scarcely a hamlet, or village, or lake, or valley, or mountain, in Vermont, that has not been a witness to his labors, and that will not be in sacred association with his memory.

Amid all the varied activities of his Diocese, he was a most tireless and successful author. In 1833, appeared his "Christianity Vindicated;" in 1834, "The Primitive Creed Examined and Explained;" in 1836, "The Primitive Church compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church;" in 1836, an "Essay on Gothic Architecture;" in 1837, "The Church of Rome in her Primitive Purity, compared with the Church of Rome at the present day;" in 1839, "Twelve Canonets, Words and Music;" in 1844, "The novelties which disturb our Peace;" in 1850, his "History of the Confessional;" in 1854, his "Refutation of Milner's 'End of Controversy';" in 1857, "The American Citizen, his rights and duties;" in 1864, "The Bible view of Slavery;" in 1866, "The Law of Ritualism;" and his "History of the Church in verse," for Sunday Schools.

The suggestion of Bishop Hopkins, in regard to the Lambeth Conference, his participation in its proceedings, the universal regard he everywhere commanded in England, his masterly rebuke to Dean Stanley, are all events so recent, and so widely known, that they need here no notice or comment.

It may be remarked, as characteristic of the position of our venerable Father in the Church, that while, on the one hand, devoted to the Primitive Faith, and Apostolic Order, and in antagonism to every Popish usurpation and corruption, yet, on the other hand, fearless for the truth and careless of popularity, he was willing to recognize and adopt whatever remained untainted by Rome.

Having attempted a visitation of his Diocese during this inclement winter, and, at the request of Bishop Potter, administered confirmation in Plattsburg, his fatigue and exposure induced congestion of the lungs, and after a few days of suffering, sitting in his chair, supported by his son, he passed sweetly away from his family on earth to the presence of his Redeemer in Heaven.

During the evening before the funeral, the body was taken from the Episcopal residence to the Parish Church. On the oaken coffin was a raised cross, and at the intersection of the arms, a radiating crown, the foot resting on a pyramid of steps. A solitary light burned above. Four of the younger clergy watched, vested in surplice and stole. Over the purple pall, with its cross of white, lay the Pastoral staff, while around were the choicest flowers, the contributions of affection.

At noon of Wednesday, a procession of five Bishops, and nearly fifty surpliced Clergy, moved down the middle of the Church. Eight laymen acting as bearers, preceded by the same number of clergymen as pall-bearers, took up the body. The Bishop of Quebec said the processional sentences. On a raised catafalque, just before the altar-rail, the body was placed, and remained until after the Holy Communion. A flood of white light, pouring from a window yet unstained, gave brilliance to the flowers, and green upon the purple pall. After the Nicene Creed, the Bishop of Quebec delivered an admirable address, and was followed by the Bishop of Connecticut in a sketch of the life of the departed, closing with an appeal of most touching eloquence and beauty.

The service of the Holy Communion having been concluded, as the body was lifted, the choir broke forth into a triumphant hymn. The procession then moved to the Cemetery. At the grave, the Pastoral staff was taken up and its green wreath, being untwined, was cast into the earth, a token of Immortality. The Bishop of Rhode Island said the opening sentences. The Bishop of Connecticut pronounced the committal. The Bishop of Maine concluded the service.

#### MISSIONS.

The Advent and Epiphany Appeals of the Domestic and Foreign Boards are at once painful and encouraging—painful in showing us how small our contributions in proportion to our wealth, and encouraging, in demonstrating a most wonderful growth in the enterprise and the benefactions of the Church. During the fiscal year, the receipts of the Committee were more than thirty-one thousand dollars in excess of any previous year, amounting to nearly one hundred and ten thousand dollars. The Spirit of Missions has increased its circulation to nearly eight thousand paying subscribers. Twenty-eight thousand young soldiers have been enrolled in the Domestic Missionary army. There are now in the field four Missionary Bishops and two hundred and thirteen Missionaries, with one vacancy in the Episcopacy to be supplied. To increase our pleasure and our confidence, the Board have had the heroism to ask the Church, during the present year, for *two hundred thousand dollars*, and, notwithstanding the discouragements of the times we believe this bold and noble faith, inspired by the energy of a new Missionary life, will have its reward.

The *Board of Foreign Missions* has also dared to make large demands, and we most sincerely hope that the response will be correspondingly liberal. It gives us pleasure here to publish its resolutions, with the prayer that the Church, in rising to the measure of this appeal, may experience a new impulse of zeal and love, which shall eventually plant Her in every portion of our world.

*Resolved*, That the prosecution of the Apostolic work of evangelizing the nations is essential to the spiritual welfare of our Apostolic Church, and that, as a means of increasing the vitality of our Church at home, renewed efforts should be made to direct the attention of the younger clergy, and of candidates for orders, to the manifest call of God for more laborers among the heathen, and elsewhere in Foreign parts.

*Resolved*, That the Board recognize the duty of the Church to provide, during the coming year, ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS for the support of her Foreign Missions; that the Committee be requested to use diligently such ordinary and special means, as may be in their power, to secure that sum, and that each member of the Board hold himself pledged to keep in mind and heart the recognition of his duty adherently to sustain it.

#### SOCIETY FOR THE INCREASE OF THE MINISTRY.

It appears from the Epiphany Appeal, that, during the academic year 1866-7, aid has been rendered to 132 pupils in various Theological Seminaries. Since the organization of the society, the whole number assisted has been 357—of these, 27 have been ordained this year—making in all 127, who have reached the ministry by its aid. The receipts for the year from 29 Dioceses have been \$21,000—\$3,000 over the past year. The Treasury, however, is exhausted, and 70 applications have been refused, or deferred. The appeal to the Church to increase her efforts in preparing her sons for the ministry, is most earnest.

## AMUSEMENTS AND MISSIONS.

It is exceedingly interesting to observe the difference in the amounts contributed in the various Dioceses throughout our vast Republic to the cause of Domestic Missions; and the sums lavished on certain kinds of entertainments in the single city of New York. We perceive, by the contrast, that while the Church has so laudably increased her contributions, she still falls painfully below the measure of her duty. The profit realized from mere spectacular amusement, appealing only to the eye and ear, shows a decline from that more substantial and manly taste which demanded elevated sentiment, true poetry, and superior histrionic delineation. It is said, that New York expends more on the theatre than either London or Paris. But we hasten to annex the tabular statements.

## DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

During the year 1867, Maine contributed to Domestic Missions, \$213.62; New Hampshire, \$215.16; Vermont, \$378.75; Massachusetts, \$6,457.04; Rhode Island, \$2,418.52; Connecticut, \$6,289.26; New York, \$39,632.09; Western New York, \$3,329.52; New Jersey, \$2,437.68; Pennsylvania, \$6,690.16; Pittsburgh, \$1,635.83; Delaware, \$311.14; Maryland, \$3,948.96; Virginia, \$163; North Carolina, \$127.60; South Carolina, \$197.26; Georgia, \$77.50; Florida, \$39; Mississippi, \$53.70; Louisiana, \$92.75; Texas, \$12; Arkansas, \$140.25; Tennessee, \$25.33; Kentucky, \$1,739.95; Ohio, \$853.37; Indiana, \$196.68; Illinois, \$2,865.49; Michigan, \$921.48; Wisconsin, \$601.39; Minnesota, \$421.18; Iowa, \$190.07; Missouri, \$909.75; Kansas, \$24.21; Nebraska, \$120.78; Dakota, \$3.30; Washington, \$100.50; Oregon, \$61; California, \$141.15; Young Soldiers of Christ, \$7,799.31; Legacies, \$10,804; Miscellaneous, \$6,617.54; Total, \$109,251.07.

## THEATRES, ETC., IN NEW YORK CITY.

Academy of Music,	\$165,089
Broadway Theatre,	174,101
Bowery Theatre,	87,374
Butler's American Theatre,	62,482
Banvard's Museum,	46,466
Circus and Amphitheatre,	186,230
French Theatre,	73,732
Kelly & Leon's Minstrels,	68,846
Niblo's Theatre,	505,864
New York Theatre,	127,109
Olympic Theatre,	216,069
Fifth Avenue Opera House,	43,690
San Francisco Minstrels,	92,279
Stadt Theatre,	92,337
Steinway Hall,	148,000
Theatre Comique,	36,406
Tony Pastor's,	84,516
Wallack's Theatre,	246,327
<b>New York total,</b>	<b>\$2,456,917</b>

## BROOKLYN.

Academy of Music,	\$74,908
Hooley's Minstrels,	46,549
Park Theatre,	86,101
Eddy's Opera House,	31,548
<b>Brooklyn total,</b>	<b>\$239,106</b>
<b>New York city,</b>	<b>\$2,456,917</b>
<b>Brooklyn,</b>	<b>239,106</b>
Add other amusements, circuses, shows, panoramas, &c., exhibited in	
New York and Brooklyn, not included in the above statement.....	
	467,551
<b>Grand total</b>	<b>\$3,163,574</b>

## NEW YORK. THE NEW DIOCESE.

A meeting was held at St. Paul's Chapel, Troy, it is announced, for the purpose of taking measures to raise by subscription the amount credited to Troy to aid the endowment fund necessary to the establishment of the new Diocese. Rev. Dr. Coit presided, and a resolution was adopted, pledging the Episcopalians of Troy to subscribe the sum of \$10,000 towards the proposed endowment fund. It is understood that Albany will contribute at least \$15,000.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

From the Journal of the Diocesan Convention, we gather the following statistics:

Whole number of parishes in the table, 179. Number of parishes reporting, 159. Edifices, 133. Sitzings, 45,979. Parsonages, 55. Baptisms—adults, 570; infants, 3,018. Confirmed, 1,774. Communicants—added new, 1,729; added by removal, 760; died or removed, 1,134; present number, 18,180. Marriages, 1,069. Burials, 2,173. Sunday School teachers, 2,665; Sunday School pupils, 27,463. Bible Classes—teachers, 158; members, 3,839. Parochial collections—alms for poor, \$28,029.02; for schools and libraries, \$23,322.87; improvements, repairs and current expenses, \$123,926.57; pew rents and subscriptions for salaries, \$164,511.79; miscellaneous, \$75,406.26; total parochial collections, \$415,196.51. Extra-parochial collections, missions—Diocesan, \$12,091.98; Domestic, \$19,414.35; Foreign, \$14,550.41; Church hospital, \$9,594.74; books, book societies, and theological education, \$19,705.04; miscellaneous, \$51,956.48; total extra-parochial collections, \$139,680.96.

## MASSACHUSETTS. CAMBRIDGE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL.

In a period not much over six months from the creation of Mr. Reed's munificent trust, the endowment of the Cambridge Theological School has been nearly doubled. Commodious buildings have been procured for the use of the Seminary, and an estate of six acres has been purchased or leased. A very valuable and central lot in, sufficient proximity to the Colleges, has been purchased, and the erection of a church edifice, as a Seminary chapel, as well as a pew church for general use, will be at once commenced. The Seminary has now begun its immediate work, of preparing students for the ministry; and though the number in attendance is small at present, yet the situation and claims of the institution indicate an early increase. Two immediate wants, however, are to be met. The first is a Library. The second is, a fund for incidental expenses.

## CONNECTICUT.

**LEGACIES.**—The late Mrs. William H. Phelps, of Winsted, bequeathed to St. James' Church and Parish, Winsted, \$5,000, the avails to be applied to the support of preaching.

To Nashotah Theological Seminary, \$4,000.

To the Seabury Mission of Faribault, Minn., \$4,000.

To the Missionary Society of the Diocese, \$4,000.

To the aged and Infirm Clergy and Widows' Fund of the Diocese, \$4,000.

To the New York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, \$3,000; the increase to be used in purchasing books for distribution to needy Parishes.

To the Foreign Missions of the P. E. Church in the United States, one-half for Africa, and one-half for China, \$2,000.

To the P. E. Freedman's Commission, \$1,000.

## OHIO.

The Committee of fifteen, appointed at the last Diocesan Convention, it is said, have agreed upon a Report, substantially embracing two points:—

1. That the Diocese of Ohio, and the interests of the several Churches, require more frequent Episcopal visitations.

2. That, when a fund of \$40,000 shall be raised north of the line indicated by Bishop McIlvaine, and an equal sum south of that line, they would recommend a division.

**BISHOP ELECT OF GEORGIA.**

The presiding Bishop, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Smith, of Kentucky, has taken order for the Consecration of the Rev. Dr. Beckwith, Bishop elect of Georgia.

The Consecration, D. V., is to take place in St. John's Church, Savannah, on Thursday, April 2d.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. Atkinson, Bishop of North Carolina, is to act as Consecrator, assisted by the Bishops of South Carolina and Alabama.

The Sermon, at the request of the Bishop elect, is to be preached by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Wilmer, Bishop of Alabama.

**OREGON.**

The meeting of the House of Bishops in New York, on Wednesday, the 5th ult., resulted in an election which we hail with great satisfaction. The Rev. Benjamin H. Paddock, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Detroit, Michigan, was elected to the Missionary Bishopric of Oregon and Washington. Dr. Paddock is a thorough and conservative Churchman, a scholar of fine attainments, and remarkably energetic and successful in parochial labors. He was graduated at Trinity College in the year 1848, spent the following year at Cheshire, Ct., as an instructor in the Episcopal Academy, went from there to the General Theological Seminary, and, having completed the regular course of study there, was elected, after his ordination—at once, we believe—to the Rectorship of Trinity Church, Norwich, Ct., afterwards taking his present Rectorship.

Since this notice was written, we are pained to see that Dr. Paddock has declined.

**CALIFORNIA. SAN JOSE.**

On the 13th of November the Convocation of the First District met at San José, to welcome Dr. Breck and his associates to their new field of Missionary labor. The Bishop of the Diocese, the Dean, and several clergy, besides those of the Mission, were present. In the evening there was a social gathering of clergy and laity. It was held at the "Mission House," which is to be the residence of the Missionaries for the winter. The building contains about twelve rooms, and was furnished, before Dr. Breck's arrival, by means of funds obtained by the Bishop in San Francisco. The students connected with the Mission have begun their studies, two of the clergy have commenced holding services at Santa Clara, and one has undertaken work at San Juan and Watsonville. On the 14th of November, in Trinity Church, morning prayer was said, the Bishop preached upon self-denial as it applied to Missionary labor, and the Holy Eucharist was celebrated. In the afternoon, after the clergy had attended the daily service which is held at the "Mission House," there was a business meeting of the Association. In the evening a Missionary meeting was held in Trinity Church. After religious services, the Bishop made an address, cordially welcoming the Missionary party to the Diocese. The Dean then spoke of the need of such schools as Dr. Breck was about to establish, in order to have an increase in the number of candidates for Holy Orders. The Dean was followed by Dr. Breck, who stated what course he and his co-laborers intended to pursue in founding Church institutions and performing Missionary labor.

**NEBRASKA.**

Twelve hundred dollars were raised in St. Thomas's parish, N. Y., during the first week of the new year, and presented to Bishop Clarkson, by the Rector, the Rev. Dr. Morgan. One thousand dollars of this amount is to be devoted to a new church in Nebraska, to be named St. Thomas's, and two hundred dollars applied to the Training School, projected by the Bishop.

The Missionary from the Santa Sioux Agency writes thus encouragingly:

This whole tribe is now well nigh Christianized. We number our communicants by hundreds, and the baptized people are over a thousand souls. We have translated the Prayer Book, and other books, into the Indian language. And, on the Lord's Day, and all other Holy Days, the full service of the Church is said and sung in the Indian tongue. Our congregations fill our chapel, and it is the uniform testimony of all who have worshipped with us, that, as far as man may judge, these people are devout and earnest worshippers of our Father in Heaven. Our schools, too, are full, nearly two hundred having been in attendance during the last term.



## SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

## ARCHBISHOP PHILARETE.

A really great light has been recently extinguished in Russia. Perhaps few Americans have heard of Archbishop Philarete. Yet his influence has been most widely extended over Russia. He has been for half a century the preacher selected there on the greatest national occasions. He almost lived in the pulpit, and also wielded a vast influence as an author. The Great Catechism, found in every school and home throughout the wide dominion of the Czars, is principally the work of the late Archbishop of Moscow. His books are all on religious topics.

He began to write in 1811, when he published some sermons; in 1813, he printed a funeral oration on the death of Prince Golenischeff-Kontoussoff. In 1814 appeared his first political sermon, called, "The Voice of Him that crieth in the Wilderness,"—a composition of very considerable merit. This discourse appears to have established his fame as a preacher. About the same time, he published "An Examination of the Moral Causes of the Surprising Successes of Russia in the War of 1812," and a commentary on the Sixty-seventh Psalm. These works were followed in 1815 by "Dialogues between a Skeptic and a Believer on the Orthodox Greco-Russian Church." Next year came out a much more ambitious work, entitled "A Sketch of Ecclesiastico-Biblical History," and another, called "Notes on the Book of Genesis." This last work it was, which procured for him the friendship of Alexander, who gave him the Bishopric of Revel. The "Great Catechism" came out in 1826, and, since then, Philarete's publications have been limited to sermons. He brought out two volumes in 1844, of which a second edition appeared in 1848. A third volume of collected discourses appeared in 1861, and this, we believe, was the Archbishop's last literary effort.

Philarete's sermons, both in matter and form, much more resemble the best specimens of English pulpit eloquence than those of Romish preachers, such as Bossuet, Massillon, Fenelon, or the more philosophical disquisitions which are favored in Protestant Germany.

The frequency with which Scripture quotations are introduced, is another feature in which Philarete's sermons differ strikingly from those of Romish preachers, and approximate closely to the Anglican fashion. Russia has an authorized version of the Bible, which is as exclusively used as King James's translation among ourselves, and religious thoughts have thus naturally embodied themselves in that country in Scriptural phraseology, to an extent impossible in France or Italy, for example, where different versions exist in competition with each other. The theology of the sermons is Greek, of course, but the peculiarities of the Eastern Orthodoxy are by no means prominent.

A very large proportion of the discourses would pass muster with an average English congregation. The Archbishop's views appear to have been as nearly as possible identical with those of the early Anglicans, such as Hooker, barring the Eastern reverence for relics, and a belief now and then expressed in the efficacy of prayers to the saints. The doctrine of sacramental grace is assumed, without being much insisted on, as is the Real Presence in the Eucharist, but the Archbishop scarcely believed in transubstantiation. Of Mariolatry there is not a trace, though the Virgin is sometimes spoken of in terms not usual with Protestants, and auricular confession is never enjoined. The Fathers are sometimes quoted, Chrysostom especially, but, with this exception, the good Archbishop's reading would seem to have been confined pretty much to his Bible. There is no evidence in his sermons that he knew anything of English or German theological works, or had any appreciation of the great religious crisis which is agitating Western Europe. For all that appears, he might have been preaching in "The Ages of Faith," which indeed have hardly yet come to an end in Russia.

Personally, the late Archbishop was much beloved and venerated. He was not only pious, but benevolent and affable. He could never be induced to sit for his portrait, even to a photographer, but numerous likenesses, furtively obtained, are in circulation in Russia. From the one prefixed to M. Serpinet's French translation of the Sermons, and which seems to have been recently taken, he must

have been a man of impressive and venerable aspect. He wore a long flowing beard, as is the custom of Eastern Ecclesiastics. As stated in the newspapers, he was eighty-three years of age, having been born in 1784. His family name was Drozdoff. He entered the service of the Church in 1808, became Archbishop of Moscow in 1821, and was raised to the dignity of Metropolitan in 1826, by Nicholas, on the occasion of his coronation.

We would suggest to those desirous of promoting a union with the Greek Church, that selections from the Archbishop's works, might, just now, be highly serviceable to their cause, and we are not certain that their publication would not be peculiarly profitable. The procession accompanying the body of the Archbishop to the Kremlin exhibited the utmost magnificence of the Greek Church.

#### THE NEW PRIMATE OF MOSCOW.

The official appointment of Mgr. Innocent, Archbishop of Kamtschatka, to the dignity of Primate of Moscow, in the room of the late venerable Philarete, is announced. The new Archbishop, who was but a simple Priest thirty-five years ago, had devoted himself to the holy mission of converting to Christianity the idolatrous population of that Asiatic country, and, by his untiring zeal and eloquent language, obtained results so important, that, in a few years, there arose a necessity to raise Kamtschatka into a new Diocese. The worthy Missionary, who was then named Jean Veniaminof, was married, and the father of several children. He repaired to Moscow, to lay before Mgr. Philarete, the requirements of the new See. During his stay in the city, he received the news of the unexpected death of his wife, whom he had left in good health. Having thus become a widower, he was in the condition required for the Episcopacy, and Mgr. Philarete did not hesitate to confer on him the dignity, to which, in no circumstances, would his modesty have allowed him to pretend. M<sup>me</sup>. Potenkin, who is always ready when there is a work of charity to perform, undertook to bring up the Missionary's daughters, educate them, and marry them honorably. The simple Priest then became a Bishop, under the title of Innocent, and returned to Kamtschatka. He is now elevated to the place made vacant by the death of the venerable Philarete,—the loftiest Ecclesiastical position in the vast Empire of the Czars.

#### THE NEW BISHOP OF NATAL.

The person chosen for this difficult post, is the Rev. W. K. Macrorie, M. A., of Brasenose College, Oxford, formerly a master of Radley College, afterwards incumbent of Wapping, and since presented to the living of St. James's, Accrington, by the Hulme Trustees.

Mr. Macrorie is said to be a man of moderate views, and of a character at once energetic and conciliatory.

To avoid some technical legal objections, it was proposed to consecrate him in Scotland. His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, finally withdrew his approval from the plan, and the whole matter remains in suspense.

#### THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE WESLEYAN BODY.

The members of both Houses of Convocation for the Northern Province, assembled on the 6th, at York Cathedral, for the transaction of business. Among the other business, was a motion by the Ven. Archdeacon Hamilton, that, "whereas there now existed a very general desire for Christian Unity, and the causes which led to the formation of the Wesleyan body as a distinct community were sensibly diminished, it was the opinion of the house that an attempt should be made to effect brotherly reconciliation between the Wesleyan body and the Church of England, and therefore, with a view of promoting this most desirable object, a committee of this house be appointed to enter into communication with the president of the Wesleyan Conference, and to invite him to procure the nomination of an equal number of that body, to meet such committee for the purpose of considering the possibility of a thorough re-union between the Wesleyan community and the Church of England." The Archdeacon of Carlisle seconded the motion. Chancellor Thurlow, the Bishop of Ripon, and Archdeacon Pollock, spoke against

the motion; and Archdeacon Churton, the Rev. C. Cater, and the Rev. Canon Hornby expressed themselves in favor of the motion. Archdeacon Dumford moved that a committee be appointed to consider and report whether there be a reasonable probability of union, and upon what terms and in what manner such an attempt should be made.

#### ITALY.

The following is reported,—we will not vouch its truth:—

On the evening of the 7th inst., the Pope signed the bull convening the universal Episcopate for an (Ecumenical Council to assemble at Rome on December 8, 1868. The bull, which bears the date of the 8th, exactly one year before the appointed day of meeting, will be disseminated without delay.

Also,—in Secret Consistory, on the 20th ult., the Pope delivered the Allocution on the perils of the temporal power, with thanksgiving for recent events. We give part of its concluding paragraph, as a contrast to the form of prayer left by the only true Head of the Church:—

"That God may the more readily hearken to our prayers, we implore fresh intercession of the Immaculate Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, who is for us all a mother full of affection, the *most powerful aid* of all Christians, who obtains what she seeks for, and is never frustrated. We then have recourse to the intercession of the blessed St. Peter, the Prince of Apostles; of Paul, his colleague Apostle; and of all saints who reign with Christ in Heaven."

#### CANADA.

BISHOP STRACHAN.—The funeral of this eminent Prelate was one of the most imposing events ever witnessed in Western Canada. His humility, his piety, his energy, his executive ability, his successful labors, constrained from all classes an affectionate remembrance. His funeral is thus described:—The bells in St James's Cathedral which were muffled, commenced pealing a little before midnight, on Monday night, and continued to play a mourning requiem, till the body was committed to its last resting-place. The solemn music of the bells had a very peculiar effect—being so much unlike anything of the kind that had ever been heard in this city, that all who listened to their mournful notes felt the more the sadness of the event, which had occasioned the playing of the melancholy dirges. The inside of the Church presented a very sombre appearance—daylight being excluded, and the edifice being draped with deep mourning. The few gas lights that were used, had the effect of adding to the solemnity which was everywhere visible. Festoons of black cloth hung along in front of the gallery, beneath the pillars; the aisles were carpeted with black, and the organ, reading-desk, and Altar, were draped in black. The scene was impressive in the extreme, and one not easily to be forgotten. The Church was crowded to excess—the main body occupied by those who took part in the procession, and the gallery, by ladies and children. The introductory sentences were chanted, and a hymn and anthems were sung, in addition to the regular services. The grave is beneath the chancel, in front of the large window in the north end of the Cathedral—the floor of that portion of the Altar having been removed, for the purpose of having the grave placed there. The vault, which is constructed of brick, is about six feet in depth, and about the same distance from the foundation wall. The Altar will, in future, stand over the vault that contains the ashes of him who so often officiated there, and, from that very spot, called upon his Divine Master to bless his flock. A large stone slab has been placed on the mouth of the grave, and an arch about four feet in height. At the conclusion of the service, a large number of spectators, many of whom were ladies, gathered around the mouth of the grave, and took a farewell look at it, and then sorrowfully departed from the Cathedral.

---

[Most of our items of Home and Foreign Intelligence are omitted for want of room. We had prepared a synopsis of the Committee Reports of the Lambeth Conference, and wished to notice the Ritualistic Blue Book, and Wolverhampton Congress.